

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XXIV. No. 21
WHOLE No. 598

March 12, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
{ PRICE, 10 CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	489-492
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Presidents of Three Republics—Serbia in Success—Motion Pictures and Censorship—The K. of C. and Radicalism.....	493-500
COMMUNICATIONS	500-501
EDITORIALS	
Reform Begins at Home—The Question of Citizenship—Juvenile Delinquency and the Home—A Blow to Americanism—An Unamendable Bill	502-504
LITERATURE	
Mr. Chesterton's New Books—Fettered, Yet Free, 1921—Reviews—Books and Authors....	505-508
EDUCATION	
The Smith-Towner Bill Is Not Dead.....	509-510
SOCIOLOGY	
The Labor Spy in American Industry.....	510-511
NOTE AND COMMENT	511-512

Chronicle

Home News.—President Warren Gamaliel Harding and Vice-President Calvin Coolidge took the oath of office shortly after noon on March 4. Mr. Harding's

Inauguration of President inaugural address followed precedent and was a general indication of principles rather than a sharp definition of policies. It followed the lines of broad and accepted Americanism and has been received for the most part without hostile comment. He began by an expression of his high appreciation of the ideals of liberty which prevail in the United States, insisted on the traditional attitude of "non-involvement in Old World affairs," and the equally traditional policy of complete independence in the management of our own affairs. "A world super-government," he declared, "is contrary to everything we cherish and can have no sanction by our Republic." The unselfishness of the United States, he said, is unquestioned and its concern for the preservation of civilization; it is ready to associate itself with the nations of the world "for conference, for counsel," but it cannot be a party to any permanent military alliance, or to political commitments, nor will it assume economic obligations, or subject its decisions to any other authority

than its own. On this question, he said, there had been a national referendum, and the matter was settled.

He advocated enlarged activities and expanded confidence in the new order of finance and trade, called attention to the supreme task of resuming normal ways by reconstruction, readjustment and restoration, severely scored profiteering, and urged full cooperation with the Government on the part of all citizens. After paying a graceful compliment to the refining influence which he believed women would exercise on the ideals of the nation by their induction into political life, he made a strong plea for industrial peace, pointed to a new era in transportation, production and trade, regulated by a wise tariff, and expressed his hope for an equality of possession and rewards that would make our country "an America of homes, illumined by hope and happiness, where mothers freed from the necessity for long hours of toil beyond their own doors, may preside as befits the hearthstone of American citizenship." The speech concluded with a pledge that the Administration would promote an "understanding of government purely as an expression of the popular will." Declaring that he accepted the responsibility of the Presidency with singleness of purpose and humility of spirit, and that he implored the favor and guidance of God in His heaven, he ended with these words:

I have taken the solemn oath of office on that passage of Holy Writ wherein it is asked, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and walk humbly with thy God?" This I plight to God and country.

Immediately after the completion of the inauguration speech, he laid before the Senate the names of the members of his Cabinet:

Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes of New York; Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon of Pennsylvania; Secretary of War, John W. Weeks of Massachusetts; Attorney General, Harry M. Daugherty of Ohio; Postmaster General, Will H. Hays of Indiana; Secretary of the Navy, Edwin Denby of Michigan; Secretary of the Interior, Albert B. Fall of New Mexico; Secretary of Agriculture, Henry C. Wallace of Iowa; Secretary of Commerce, Herbert C. Hoover of California; Secretary of Labor, James J. Davis of Indiana.

These nominations were reported on favorably by the various committees and confirmed by the Senate without delay.

The first action taken by the new Administration was to issue a warning in the nature of an ultimatum to the Governments of Costa Rica and Panama, calling on them to suspend hostilities immediately. Warships were at the same time ordered to proceed to the Atlantic and

Pacific side of the Isthmus, with a view to protecting the property of the United States. The action of the Government is based on the right to protect the Panama Canal given to the United States in the treaty entered into by this country and Panama, and is a continuance of the policy already adopted by the preceding Administration.

Peace Conference.—The meeting of the Council of the League with the representatives of the German Government took place on March 1 at London. The Allies

Ultimatum to Germany refused even to consider the counter-proposals made by the Germans, and

on March 3 served on them an ultimatum, demanding that they make other and satisfactory proposals, or else manifest their intention of accepting the Paris decisions. The time limit set for the German reply was March 7. To this demand was attached a notification that penalties would be applied at once, if the German reply were unsatisfactory.

At the session on March 1, Dr. Simons, speaking for the German Government, proposed to pay the Allies an indemnity of 30,000,000,000 gold marks, as contrasted

German Proposals with the 226,000,000,000 gold marks demanded by the Paris Conference.

Starting with the assumption that the Allies preferred credits that could be mobilized immediately to promises of future payments, and that the Germans preferred a definite sum to the indefinite sum of the Treaty, he said that if the sums due under the Paris proposals were discounted at eight per cent their present value would be 50,000,000,000 gold marks. This sum Germany was willing to pay. As a matter of fact, however, 20,000,000,000 gold marks of this total had already been paid in deliveries made to the Allies since the armistice. The sum, therefore, which Germany undertook to pay amounted to 30,000,000,000 gold marks. Of this last-mentioned amount Germany would pay 8,000,000,000 gold marks at once, provided an international loan to that amount, exempt from income tax and bearing five per cent interest, was floated. Of the remaining 22,000,000,000 gold marks Germany believed 1,000,000,000 could be paid annually up to the year 1926, when the country would reach its maximum capacity. In 1926 another conference would be held to determine subsequent payments extending over thirty years. The twelve per cent *ad valorem* tax on German exports he declared to be impracticable. As conditions for carrying out the German proposals, Dr. Simons demanded that Upper Silesia should be retained by Germany and that Germany should be restored to free commercial privileges throughout the world.

Having set forth the general outline of the German counter-proposals, Dr. Simons requested that an expert be permitted to read the details of the plan. Mr. Lloyd George, who was presiding at the meeting, cut short both Dr. Simons and the session with the following remark:

You can put in any documents you please. But the German Government appears to have a complete misunderstanding of the realities of the situation, and the Allies have already agreed that the German proposal is one that they cannot examine or discuss as an alternative to the Paris plan.

On March 2 the Allies met in conference and decided that the German proposal "does not merit either examination or discussion." That same day they published a

Criticism by Allies document in which they called attention to some of the features of the proposal, the most important of which

are the following: Two kinds of annuities were included in the Paris proposal: variable and fixed. The variable annuities were disregarded altogether in the German proposal, the fixed annuities were very considerably lessened. This lessening arose from the false assumption made by the Germans that they were at liberty to calculate all the fixed annuities on a basis of eight per cent, whereas this privilege extended only to discounts of fixed annuities made in the first two years. As a consequence there was a wide discrepancy between the German figure and that of the Paris figure, the former being 50,000,000,000 and the latter over 83,000,000,000.

The total sum set by the Paris conference, the document declares, is over and above the sum already paid in deliveries by the Germans according to the Versailles Treaty. The German plan includes the latter sum in the total sum. The Germans claim that 20,000,000,000 gold marks have already been paid in deliveries; the Reparations Commission estimates the value of these deliveries at less than half the German figure. The Germans use an eight per cent table for arriving at the sum due them; at the same time they propose that the interest on their debt shall be limited to five per cent. The German plan proposes that their securities shall be relieved of taxation in the country of issue, thus burdening the country of issue with part of their liabilities. The document, after remarking that the sum proposed in the German plan is only a small fraction of the sum set by the Paris conference, closes with the observation:

The consequence would be that Germany's external debt which is limited to her reparation liability would correspond to a small proportion only of the external debts which the Allies were compelled to contract for the war.

On March 3, Mr. Lloyd George gave the formal answer of the Allies to the German counter-proposals. He declared that these proposals constitute a definite challenge to the fundamental conditions of the Versailles Treaty. Noting

Reply of Allies that substantial relaxations had been granted by the Allies in a spirit of concession to induce an amicable settlement with Germany, he said that the Germans were making the treaty a mockery, and that this was clear not merely from the proposals but from the speeches delivered by Dr. Simons in Germany and the applause with which they had been received.

The basis of the treaty, he stated, was the responsibility

of the Germans for the war. This responsibility had been repudiated by the Germans, and the new German proposals were the corollary of that repudiation. The Allies, therefore, declare that responsibility has been fixed on the Germans by the final judgment of the Allies, that the Allied judgment was supported by the declared assent of almost the whole of the civilized world, and that conferences with Germany were futile until that responsibility had been accepted by that country and her obligations interpreted accordingly.

Disclaiming any intention of oppressing Germany, he said that the Allies simply asked that she should discharge her obligations and repair injuries inflicted by the war, for which the Imperial Government was responsible. In demanding reparation the Allies were acting on the precedent set by Germany in the Treaty of Frankfort, with this difference, that, whereas Germany on that occasion had demanded that France should pay the costs of the war, the Allies were not asking one penny for the costs of the war. All that the Allies were asking was reparation for material damage and injuries inflicted on the lives and limbs of the inhabitants.

To give the German people some conception of the damage inflicted by their armies, he gave a detailed account of some of the items of destruction: houses destroyed, 310,269; houses partly destroyed, 313,675; factories destroyed, 29,000; townships totally destroyed, 1,659; townships three-quarters destroyed, 707; townships half destroyed, 1,656; railways destroyed, 8,000 kilometers; bridges destroyed, 5,000; highways destroyed, 52,000 kilometers; land devastated, 9,386,000 acres; mines destroyed, with a reduction in annual production of 21,000,000 tons, 10. Of this destruction a portion was the result of the direct action of war, but an incredible amount of it "was done deliberately with a view to destroy essential means of production." He quoted General von Bissing's statement that the object of the destruction in Belgium was "to provide that Belgium's recovering industry should not prejudice German industry."

Contrasting the undamaged condition of the German homes and factories with the crippled condition of the homes and the sources of production in the Allied countries, he pointed out that unless the Germans were made to pay the reparation charges, the victors would pay the price of defeat and the vanquished would reap the fruits of victory. Mr. Lloyd George called attention to the fact that Great Britain had suffered the destruction of 8,000,000 tons of mercantile shipping; that France had lost 1,400,000 men and has to pay pensions to 3,500,000 people; that Great Britain had lost 1,000,000 men and has to pay pensions to cripples numbering about 1,700,000. These figures took no account of the losses inflicted on Belgium and Italy. The consequence was that Great Britain alone and France alone were forced to bear an annual burden for the maintenance of dependents and cripples and maimed, which is almost three times the amount of the whole annual payment offered by Ger-

many to meet the claim for damages of all kinds. The Germans proposed to pay only one-fourth of the reduced sum asked by the Allies. And the condition under which Germany offered to pay this one-fourth, was that the Allies must find money out of their own pockets and lend it to the Germans on highly privileged terms. A further evidence of the insincerity of the Germans was their failure to tax the German population to the same extent as the people in the Allied countries were being taxed, so that in the matter of taxation they insist, in spite of having been vanquished, on being less heavily burdened than the victors.

The matter of reparations, therefore, taken with other failures to meet the terms of the Versailles Treaty forced the Allies to the conclusion that the German Government either has no intention of carrying out treaty obligations or has not the strength to insist on the sacrifices necessary to carry them out. The Allies therefore felt compelled to "act on the assumption that the German Government are not merely in default, but deliberately in default." The British Premier concluded by saying that, unless the German Government gave satisfactory evidence by March 7 that they intended to carry out the terms of the treaty, subject to the concessions made in the Paris proposal, the Allies would immediately occupy Duisberg, Ruhrort, and Duesseldorf, levy a tax on the sale price of German goods in Allied countries, and establish a customs line on the Rhine.

The reply of the Council of the League of Nations to the Note sent by ex-Secretary of State Colby on the status of the Island of Yap leaves the matter more or

*The Yap
Controversy*

less an open question. The Council declares that the rights acquired by the United States as one of the principal participants in the war are not likely to be questioned in any quarter. It states, however, that the allotment of the island of Yap to Japan was the work of the Supreme Council of the Allied and Associated Nations, and that the Council of the League merely approved the allotment. Of the protest of the American Government on the matter it has no official knowledge. Accordingly it has forwarded the American communication to the Supreme Council, on which responsibility for the mandate rests. Hope is expressed that the United States will see its way to sending a representative to the next meeting of the Council. The diversity of the views on the matter held by the European nations and the United States appears from the fact that President Wilson informed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on August 19, 1919, that control of the island of Yap, as being one of the centers of cable and radio communication in the Pacific, would be discussed at a general conference which was to be held for deciding the ownership of cables. At the time the President made this statement the Supreme Council's decision to give Japan a mandate over the island was already some months old.

Ireland.—The February number of the *Catholic Bulletin*, published in Dublin, contains these interesting items about the price England pays for the tyranny she is exercising in Ireland:

*Cost of
Tyranny*

The present costs of "imperial services" in Ireland are very plausibly estimated by Mr. James O'Donovan in an article published by the *Daily News* at close to £100,000,000 a year. He observes that the army of occupation was stated by Government over a year ago to be costing about £1,000,000 a month, and calculates that in its present augmented state and under "active service conditions" it must be costing £3,000,000 a month. Here is how he makes out his statement of account (for one year only) against the Government for its orgy of cruelty, insult and lies:

Military, £36,000,000; Armed police, £3,400,000; Destruction of Property, £15,000,000; Trade Loss, £25,000,000; Taxation Loss, £6,000,000; Decreased Production and Wages, £10,000,000; Internments, Propaganda, etc., £2,000,000; Total, £97,400,000.

We rather think this will be found, after mature consideration of the items, to be a very considerable understatement of the cost of England's big attempt to terrorize, calumniate and subjugate a nation in the face of Europe in the twentieth century.

These facts are of great interest to liberty-loving Americans, especially at present, when our citizens are groaning under the weight of enormous taxes. For, at the present rate of exchange, England's indebtedness to us is well over £1,000,000,000. No interest has been paid on this sum for two years, so that money that belongs to Americans is used by England to crush struggling people in Ireland, India and Mesopotamia where terror also reigns.

Despite the boasts of Lloyd George and Greenwood that Ireland would soon be pacified, the country is still turbulent to a marked degree. On Tuesday, February

*Internal
Disorders*

28, five soldiers were killed in Cork, and eleven others were wounded. The same day one man was killed and two were wounded, near Tipperary: at Gorbally also, one man was killed and two wounded: in Dublin three girls and two men were reported wounded, and the next day nine persons, including two soldiers, were wounded in Dublin, and so on. Curfew rings in Dublin at nine o'clock and social life in the city and throughout the country, for that matter, has been rendered impossible. Influential members of Parliament, under the chairmanship of the Duke of Northumberland, have been investigating and discussing the dangers that beset the British Empire. The Duke announced the findings as follows:

Our democratic institutions, and particularly our trade unions, are to be destroyed and replaced by an autocratic dictatorship of a small minority worse than any tyranny known in history. The Irish rebellion is only part of the movement. Ireland is at the present time the battle front of the revolutionaries, their immediate aim being to compel us to keep so large a garrison in that country that the forces left in Great Britain will be inadequate to deal with the Communist rising which is being prepared. In these circumstances it will be fatal if the Government should show any weakness in dealing with the murder and arson campaign now carried on there, or reward the revolutionaries with concessions, as some peace negotiators suggest.

Equally serious is the outlook in India and Egypt. We find that the revolutionary movements in these countries are of comparatively recent growth and were first inspired from America in the offices of a certain pro-German, Irish-American newspaper in New York and have all along been closely allied with the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the heads of which with their Indian accomplices were taken into the German secret service during the war.

As usual, Northumberland ignored the real cause of the trouble in Ireland, the Lloyd George Government.

Italy.—In the last days of February the situation in the Province of Bari was considered very grave as a result of the clashes between the Socialist-Communists

*Fascisti and
Communists at War*

extreme Nationalist party. Exasperated by the previous excesses of the Socialists, the Fascisti took the law into their own hands and fought their opponents with their own weapons. Dispatches from Bari to the Ministerialist organ, the *Tempo*, stated that the riots assumed a dangerous aspect. The town of Minervino Murge was practically a prey to civil war. Armed bands overran the countryside and bloody encounters occurred almost daily between the Fascisti and their foes.

The situation in Bari was the outcome of long-standing differences between the peasants and the land-owners. The former accuse the proprietors of the landed estates of not granting the concessions promised them during the war. The Socialists, profiting by the peasants' disappointment, started a propaganda of hatred against the "exploiting" bourgeoisie. The landowners, it was reported, remained inactive and made little effort to better the condition of the peasants. The latter then resorted to violence. The Fascisti alone offered any resistance. The less radical Socialists and the extreme Communists, who had split on the party program at the recent Leghorn congress, then united against the Fascisti.

The larger cities could not escape the spreading disorder. At Trieste, Spezia, Lucca, Bologna, Florence, and in several places in the Province of Emilia, Fascisti and Socialist-Communists engaged in something like a miniature civil war. Florence and Trieste, according to cables to the metropolitan press, witnessed savage scenes, which were repeated on a minor scale as far south as Reggio, in Calabria and Palermo, in Sicily. These disorders are also reported by the reliable *Osservatore Romano*. While the struggle was mainly between the Fascisti and the Socialist-Communist groups, attacks were also directed by the Communistic forces against the "Clericals" in central Italy. Roused by anarchistic propaganda, crowds of unemployed peasants attacked the Tuscania Cathedral in the Roman province, smashing crucifixes, altars, pictures, and statuary, and plundering the church of the rich offerings of countless pilgrims.

The Giolitti Government seemed helpless in the face of these disorders. Only one weak attempt was made to end them by the revocation of permits to carry arms.

The Presidents of Three Republics

A. J. MUENCH

IT is not often that the world is witness to the inauguration of the Presidents of the three most celebrated Republics of the world within a period of less than a year.

Two weeks after Deschanel resigned his office as President of the French Republic, in September of last year, because of a mental breakdown, France hailed as its new President, Alexander Millerand, until that time Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the French Cabinet. On December 16, 1920, M. Schulthess, member of the Federal Council of Switzerland, was elected President of the Helvetic Republic, succeeding President Motta, whose term of office expired with the end of the year. And on March 4, 1921, Warren G. Harding entered his four-year term of office as President of the United States. In each case, however, the presidency is of a totally different character, varying most fundamentally in powers.

The President of Switzerland is not an executive in the same sense as the President of the United States. In actual fact the powers of the executive branch of government are not vested in one person but in a body of seven men who are called the Federal Counselors. This college of seven counselors forms the executive and among them the President of Switzerland is the *primus inter pares*. In strict truth he is the President of the Federal Council which is an office similar to that of chairmanship. He presides at the meetings, directs the affairs of business, and acts as the spokesman of the Government. The position is one of honor, conveying no special presidential favors. He is elected for a term of one year only by the National Assembly, which is formed by the joint session of the Council of the nation, corresponding to the House of Representatives, and the Council of the States, corresponding to the United States Senate. Together with his colleagues of the Federal Council he does not form a separate and coordinate branch of government but is subordinate to the legislative branch. There is no separation of governmental powers, except for functional purposes suggested by the necessity of order and division of labor, as in the United States. The National Assembly, empowered to act as the legislative will of the people, is also their executive will. It even designates men as its agents and entrusts them with the execution of the laws it enacts. Hence they are also responsible to the National Assembly for their activities, an arrangement quite different from that of the United States, where the President and his Cabinet cannot be held accountable to Congress in this way. This position of the Swiss President makes his annual election quite a commonplace affair. Even as in France, where the President is likewise elected by the National Assembly, there are, there-

fore, no political conventions, no campaigns, no election scandals, and consequently, no post-election investigations because of an extravagant expenditure of money or other corrupt practices. As a matter of fact the election in Switzerland in December caused so little stir that a number of Swiss whom I questioned regarding their new President did not know that an election had taken place. This election is a matter of minor concern to them, since they know that their will is functioning through the National Assembly in Berne. Should the Assembly show signs of improper functioning the initiative or referendum is called into action to point out the correct way. Political squabbles have little room for play under such a system of election. The President is the repository of too little power to be of much interest to the political parties, and hence no political warfare arises.

As in Switzerland, so in France, the President is not elected by the nation at large, but by a joint session of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, which, for the occasion, calls itself the National Assembly. The election takes place, not in Paris where the usual parliamentary sessions are held, but in an ancient château at Versailles. According to the French Constitution this election takes place every seven years, except in case of emergency such as Deschanel's. Such a long term of office would be dangerous, were the powers of the President as vast as those of the President of the United States. This is, however, not the case. Because of his limited power the President of France has been styled *le roi de carton*.

His most important power is the *droit de dissolution*, in virtue of which he may terminate, upon the advice and with the consent of the Senate, the existence of the Chamber of Deputies. He then appeals to the nation, asking its support of this policy in the general election. The use of this power, however, is not without danger. Evidently only a strong President will use this power. To risk a general election under other circumstances would be suicidal to his prestige, for in governmental affairs the Chamber of Deputies is his master. He is a creature of its will, and hence dependent, even in his functions as an executive, upon the good will of those who elected him. For this reason his power of dissolving Parliament is not often used.

His subordinate position to the Chamber of Deputies is seen with reference to another power he wields, that of forming a ministry. Upon entering office it is incumbent upon him to select his ministry. He entrusts to a statesman whose qualities he has discussed with the presiding officer of the Senate and Chamber, and in whom he believes the nation to have confidence, the formation of a ministry. The list of ministers is presented to him for approval whereupon the ministry takes its seat in the

Chamber of Deputies, to obtain from it the vote of confidence. Should it fail to obtain this vote a new attempt to form a ministry must be made, and if all succeeding attempts fail, the President has only one other appeal, namely, to the people. He dissolves the Chamber and calls for a general election. Should the Chamber obtain the vote of confidence, it continues in existence as long as the Chamber wills, and no longer. The President has no choice in the matter.

Historical reasons account for this subordination of the French Executive to the legislative branch of the Government. The French constitution is not so firmly rooted in the life of the French people as that of America, in the life of the people of the United States. Since 1789 it was organically changed as often as eighteen times, the last constitution having been adopted in 1875. Furthermore, ambitious executives enjoying vast powers abused the advantage they enjoyed; several attempts at a *coup d'état* were made, such as those of the Prince-President Louis Napoleon, December 2, 1851, of Marshal Mac-Mahon, May 16, 1877, and of General Boulanger in 1888 and 1889. Hence it is easy to understand why the French people have inherited such a traditional distrust of executives with vast powers.

It came somewhat as a surprise that Millerand, a man who loves action, should have relinquished so influential a position as that of Prime Minister of France, together with the Post of Minister of Foreign Affairs, to become the President of the French Republic. However, Millerand is a statesman of well-defined purposes, and thus far in his political life he has not made serious mistakes. His friends are sure, therefore, that he is safe this time, also. At any rate his inaugural address would indicate that he does not mean to be a *roi de carton*, for he conceives it a strict duty of the President of the Republic "to insure the continuity of a foreign policy worthy of our victory and our dead." He could not have said openly that he is determined to be not only the President but also the Minister of Foreign Affairs in France.

In marked contrast to the presidential office of Switzerland and France is the office of the President of the United States. The American Constitution is not based on the doctrine of the subordination of the executive to the legislative branch of government, but on the full coordination of the legislative, executive and judicial departments. This is a fundamental consequence of the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers as developed in the theory of State of Montesquieu, and as championed in the brilliant essays of Hamilton, Madison and Jay, collected in the *Federalist*, of which the first number appeared October 27, 1787. Because of such a separation of powers, the President is not elected by Congress, the legislative department, but by a distinct college of electors, equal in number to the members of Congress and selected by the ballots of the people.

As an independent executive the President of the United States is the carrier of far-reaching powers. He

chooses his own Cabinet, the Senate approving; neither are the Cabinet officers members of Congress as the Ministers of the Parliament of France are; they are not subject to the vote of confidence of Congress and need give no account to it of their governmental activities. They owe responsibility to no one excepting to their Chief Executive, whom they merely assist as secretaries in his executive duties. The President has the power of a qualified veto, which is granted neither to the Presidents of Switzerland nor to the President of France. He nominates the principal Federal officers. In his capacity as Commander-in-Chief of Army and Navy he appoints military and naval officers by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He is his own foreign minister, spokesman of the nation in the conduct of foreign affairs. As such he appoints ambassadors to foreign countries, subject to the confirmation of the Senate, and makes treaties with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. This is not nearly a complete enumeration of all his powers; it characterizes only the unique and distinctive position he holds as President of the American Republic. For four years he is "the uncrowned king" of the United States. He is subject to no court of the land; only impeachment can remove him from office. From this dominant position he may wield a power that may be most beneficial to the nation if he is a wise, prudent and unambitious executive, and most dangerous, if he is unscrupulous, selfish, or dictatorial in the use of his power.

Because of the concentration of so much power in the hands of one man, it is clear why so great importance attaches to the office of presidency in the United States, why, in contrast to Switzerland and France, so much energy and so much money is spent in preparation for the presidential elections, and why political parties enter into such a fierce struggle for supremacy at the polls. The right leader in this dominating position can secure the fortunes of a political party for decades, even as a poor leader can break its fortunes during the short space of one term of office. Political strife will, consequently, always remain one of the outstanding features in American national life. It will rather even grow in extent and intensity with every further centralization of activities under the Federal Government. The greater government's jurisdiction, the greater the powers of the President as its executive and the greater too, the power of the party whose leader he is.

Serbia in Success

E. CHRISTITCH

SERBIA has borne herself well in adversity. By tenacity and valor she has overridden obstacles, defeated her enemies, gathered together her kindred and thus reached almost the summit of her hopes. True, there have been painful curtailments of territory to which Croats and Slovenes lay just claim, and there have been

big mistakes in administrative methods; but on the whole, now that they are freed from all extraneous pressure, the Southern Slavs united in one independent State should march forward confidently on the road of progress. It was not to be expected that the various elements suddenly brought together after centuries of separation should at once smoothly coalesce and work in complete harmony for admittedly identical aims. There was, and is, a natural fear on one side that Serbia which has sacrificed the most for the goal of unification, will claim a leading role in the new State. Again Serbians who erected an intensely democratic kingdom on a soil wrested from Turkish despotism, watched suspiciously for signs of a feudal mentality among the Croats and Slovenes so long subjected to the infiltration of Austrian and Magyar ideas. Only the thoughtful and experienced political leaders recognize that each section has something to gain from the other, and that mutual adaptation is the secret of agreement. If Serbia has been the pioneer, if she can point to the fact that she staked her national existence for Southern Slav freedom, if out of her population of less than 5,000,000, 1,500,000 laid down their lives for the national ideal, the Croats and Slovenes have, in different fields, a no less honorable record. Thanks to their prodigious staying power, they resisted absorption by Hun and Teuton, more insidious enemies than treacherous Bulgar or barbarous Turk. They are rightly proud of the endurance that kept them a distinct nation with sovereign attributes wrung from their hostile rulers; they are conscious of an older culture, the refinement of ages, the superiority of peaceful arts. Nor are they unworthy brothers of the Serbs in feats of heroism. They, too, like the Irish, have many times risen against their tyrants only to have the insurrection wiped out in blood. A Croat deputy did not hesitate recently to tell the Serbians in full parliament that his people had also fought with success in the late war, never mind under what banner. "The Croats defended their frontiers like lions," he said, "on the banks of the Isonzo, and flung back the would-be usurpers of our land on the field of Caporetto."

His words were enthusiastically applauded by the assembly. Just this indirect allusion to what Croatia has lost by the treaty of Rapallo showed the bitterness and the disappointment of Croats who did not foresee that peace—after their union with Serbia—would entail the cession of large tracts of land and the best of their seacoast to Italy. The Croats have grave reason for dissatisfaction, but it is somewhat illogical to denounce Serbia as ever committed to war and ready to drag the peace-loving folk of Croatia into her future wars, while at the same time blaming her for not taking up arms to save Croatian territory from Italian encroachment. After six years of war which began with the Balkan campaign that routed the Turks, Serbia was in need of rest. She did not sacrifice without a sore pang the precious heritage she had hoped to share with the Croats. Their accredited representative, Mr. Trumbic, signed the Treaty of Rapallo as

a lesser evil than many others threatening the young State. No injustice is irreparable, and the best means to hearten the Croat left outside his boundaries is to work with a will for the firm consolidation of Yugoslavia. The chief problem of the Constituent Assembly now sitting is to decide between a centralist or federalist form of government. Roughly speaking, though, there are exceptions on both sides, the Serbs incline to the former and the Croats and Slovenes to the latter. The late subjects of Austria-Hungary wish to guard their distinctive individuality. They will not belittle their past, nor merge in a "Great Serbia." But is this required of them? Only a small group of chauvinists dream of welding the various elements with hot speed into a homogeneous entity. A foremost Serbian statesman, leader of a great wing of the dominant Radical party speaks as follows:

"We cannot pass over the divergencies incidental to our historical past. Changes must go slowly and in accordance with the spirit and habits of each of our peoples. In Serbia itself, as Minister of the Interior, I was often confronted with difficulties in trying to administrate on equal lines different provinces of our small territory. Some of the best men were failures because unknown and unwelcome in the places where they were appointed. Racially we are all one, but different circumstances, customs, and traditions must be taken into account. I regret that the census of cattle, to which we are accustomed in Serbia was proceeded with in Croatia when it was clearly resented by the peasants who believed it meant eventual requisition. Those responsible, instead of braving prejudice should have sought to overcome it. If discontent supervened after the first cordial welcome extended to the Prince Regent throughout Croatia it was due to mal-administration and neglect of the susceptibilities of our new co-citizens."

While authoritative factors in Serbia maintain this attitude there is every possibility for Croats and Slovenes to assert their rights, and in the first place the preservation of their religion. Catholics cannot acquiesce in State control of education as Orthodox, to their detriment, have done. Hence, a wide form of local autonomy rather than centralization is the Croats' present objective. Unfortunately they are hampered in their parliamentary action by the abstention of a group of Croat members who, led by a distinguished peasant Utopian, Radic, dream of a little Republic of their own. These idealists believe they can live in a water-tight compartment all to themselves "now that liberty has come to the Southern Slavs," without their friends, or interference from their late enemies in the melting-pot of South-East Europe! Bitterly does the organ of the Catholic Party condemn this folly which leaves it with a poor following to defend its principles in the Constituent Assembly. It can, nevertheless, register some successes, such as the revision of the parliamentary protocol to ensure a better hearing for minorities, the reprimand of fanatics in office who substituted Cyrillic for Latin letters (these being taken as signs

of German and Magyar usurpation), and, notably, the repudiation by the Minister of Education of an attempt to introduce laymen as religious instructors in schools. Not from the Orthodox Serb, ever wrapped in his nationalism, with religion a very secondary consideration, must the Croat now defend his faith, but from the slackers and the godless at home.

Both Churches of Yugoslavia had recent triumphs over subversive elements within. The Orthodox Patriarch, in face of strong opposition, decreed the maintenance of the ancient rule forbidding the remarriage of priest-widowers and the Catholic Bishops, by their swift and determined action, defeated an attempt to foist a branch of the Czech "National Church" on Yugoslavia. The solitary recruit of the Czech schismatics, more honest and more practical than his seducers, has abandoned the sale of adulterated spiritual wares and taken to dealing in agricultural implements instead. He no longer poses as a priest, but has found scope for the natural abilities noted in the parish once committed to his care, in the busy town of Carlovats, where as importer and banker he is amassing a fortune. Truly this man, however unworthy, is an improvement on the Czechs who still affect to be concerned with religion.

Catholics the world over must watch with interest the efforts of Catholics in Yugoslavia to hold their own. It is noteworthy that *Demokratia*, organ of the supposed advocates of secularization, announces the decision of the Minister of Public Worship to study the proposals of the Catholic Bishops of the Kingdom for the forthcoming Concordat with the Vatican. It should be on even more comprehensive lines than the very generous Concordat signed by Serbia in 1914. There are manifold and complicated questions to be dealt with. The most pressing actual need would seem to be erection of a Catholic Church in the capital of Yugoslavia which possesses but

a small chapel, an annex of the former Austrian Legation.

Not only has the ever-increasing Catholic population no possibility of assisting at Divine worship, but the lack of altars prevents the celebration of Mass. Priests now come in great numbers to Belgrade on various business connected with undertakings in the Catholic districts. The Slovenes, moreover, are mostly represented in Parliament by their clergy. It is pitiful to see these devoted servants of God awaiting their turn in the early morning to perform the Sacred Rite before proceeding to the National Assembly. One cannot expect the Yugoslav Government, its hands full with providing homes for war orphans and disabled soldiers, as well as the repairing of public buildings demolished by cannon, to occupy itself just now with the spiritual needs of one section of the people. Orthodox Serbs are not accustomed to daily Mass, nor is attendance on Sundays obligatory although it is recommended. Several Serbian Cabinet Ministers have, nevertheless, given their patronage to the scheme for collecting funds to build a worthy Catholic temple in the capital of Yugoslavia, and the Prince Regent has offered to provide a site. It remains for the Croats and Slovenes the world over, whom the enterprise most concerns, to hasten its accomplishment and thus avert real dangers to the faith of their coreligionists in Belgrade. I have often watched with admiration the crowds of fervent worshipers thronging the street outside the packed yard of the little chapel on a wintry Sunday, and wondered if a better time were ever coming. The good time is now here, but there must be hearts and souls to suit it. The zealous parish priest of Belgrade, a typical Croat, has formed a Society and is collecting contributions, but the destitution after the war in these parts is only second to that of Austria. May those who were kept safe from the ravages of war supply the deficit!

Motion Pictures and Censorship

CONDÉ B. PALLENT

WHEN the automobile made its first appearance everybody wondered, not that it failed to go far and well, but that it went at all. When the motion picture first flashed on the screen people fairly gasped to see what seemed fixed and immovable move at all. To see a pictured horse galloping at full speed seemed little short of the miraculous, and to see an express train come thundering down the tracks straight at you at fifty miles an hour, threatening you with instant death, sent cold shivers down the spine.

Since then, within the easy memory of half a generation, the motion picture has leaped from the status of a startling and primitive novelty to the dignity of a world-wide medium of dramatic art. So rapid has been its development, so universal its appeal, that it has more than outdistanced the stage, both in popularity and in financial opportunity. A picture made in America today

will circle the globe within the year to the fascinated gaze of all nations and all races. The photo-play established itself permanently in the public estimation, and it has brought its problem with it—the game of problems seems to be an essential modern pastime—namely, the question of censorship, which, at the moment, has become acute.

Why the problem of censorship should attach itself especially to the motion picture and ignore the stage, the newspaper and literature, is a mystery that goes unanswered, unless it be that the motion picture, being the newest and latest prodigy in the world of human expression, is not entrenched in tradition nor grounded in custom as are its kindred mirrors of life, or, to surmise again, unless it be that its far-flung popularity and its easy access to the multitude render its possible abuses a wider source of moral peril.

Whatever the reason, the agitation for a rigid censor-

ship has concentrated on the photo-play, and there can be but little doubt that it is in many respects justified. Producers and exhibitors have used the screen with a Rabelaisian license, without the Rabelaisian genius to condone the offence. This has been a long-standing scandal which has become irritatingly acute under the impulse of the wave of lawlessness now sweeping over the land, and of the counter resentment of uplift movements which are often just as recklessly set in the contrary direction. In the conflict and shock of the meeting of two extremes there is always danger to justice. The need of proper censorship is evident. There are vulgarities and indecencies in film presentation that should be ruthlessly cut away, but there are factors in dramatic presentation which are not so easily disposed of, and which require a nice balance of judgment and an enlightened interpretation. A recent police edict in one of our largest cities was "the prohibition of all films showing a criminal in action," based upon the fact that three young criminals had alleged that their crime (robbery) had been suggested by a "crook" photo-play. This was laying the axe to the trunk of the tree to cut away some dead branches. No doubt much harm can be done by a motion picture which presents criminal action in the wrong way. A picture which heroizes, or condones crime, is a sinister influence. A picture which mitigates or glosses over or makes light of crime has no possible justification. A rigorous censorship of such pictures is much to be desired. But to repudiate and suppress a picture simply because it does depict criminal action, irrespective of the manner and purpose of this presentation, is a barbarism ignorant of human nature, and a Puritanism ignorant of morality. If the presentation of crime were to be altogether eliminated from the great drama and literature of the world, they would be so emasculated that what would be left would not be worth the while. Under such a radical method, the Bible itself would have to be put under lock and key and all the great literature of the world would have to be kept as archives in a museum along with mummies, not to be read except by specialists under strictest government regulation.

The theme of all art is the presentation of beauty, truth and goodness in contrast with and victorious over the ugly, the false and the wicked. Its purpose is to show the triumph of the virtues over the vices which would destroy them. Without this conflict in life and its reflection in art, man would sink to the level of the fish or the monkey. And so with the sex relation. It, too, is fundamental in human nature. It has its proper and legitimate place in life and in art. But when that relation is debased into lubricity, as has been too often the case in the photo-play, a judicious and sane censorship becomes a crying need.

The weakest spot in censorship has been its lamentable and obvious failure in guarding against the lubricious on the screen, and this is mainly because censorship

boards usually have no higher nor better standard of purity than the general public from whom their membership is drawn, for the star of purity burns almost as low and dim on the social horizon today as it did during the Priapian lustra of Nero and Caligula. There can be no doubt here of a much needed reform—but how is that to be brought about?

In the zeal for reform prudery is apt to usurp the throne of common sense. A rigid and indiscriminate application of rules and regulations, excellent in themselves, often works a gross injustice. The censor, more than often unintelligent and narrow, applies his regulations, as the carpenter does his rule, just so many inches to the foot, and cuts out of the film anything that does not mechanically measure with his wooden standard. There may be a regulation prohibiting scenes "showing the destruction of property." Forthwith the censor cuts out any scene showing any destruction of any property, no matter what the context or the sequence. In another instance there may be a regulation forbidding "scenes of violence." In Boston a motion picture of the Life of Our Lord was prohibited from being shown on Sundays because it had scenes of violence in it, namely, the Scourging at the Pillar, and the Crucifixion! Censorship of that character is as obnoxious as the bubonic plague and on the level of the intelligence of the clay eaters of Alabama.

The whole crux of censorship rests upon the intelligence and character of the censor. A blue-law censor, who understands neither human nature nor morals, puts the drama in the stocks. A wooden-headed censor, who measures by the foot and the yard, makes the drama a sorry thing of shreds and patches. A loose-minded censor who believes that conventions are prison bars to the human spirit and that art should tolerate no restrictions, debases the drama to the abandon of Venus Epistropheia.

There is but one way to solve the difficulty, and the solution is far from easy, viz., censor boards composed of people of such high character and intelligence as to ensure sane and balanced decisions. For the sake of uniform rules and regulations and to eliminate the irritating confusions and injustices that now obtain through the conflicting decisions of local and State boards, censorship should be national, under Federal supervision. Censors should enjoy no less dignity than judges on the bench. Responsible guardians of public morals in censorship are as vital to the public welfare as responsible guardians of the law; their emolument should be equivalent and their standing no less in the community. When this need is realized censorship will be esteemed at its proper worth, and the right kind of censors be sought to be duly compensated and esteemed.

The motion picture has become not only the most popular medium of the drama, but a far-reaching publicity agency, a potent educational factor and, what is little realized, a living pictorial record of great and small

events. It visualizes the world to all the rest of the world. Scenes remote, alien and local are enacted before our eyes daily just as they have occurred. Great personages and great events are brought home to us as vividly as the originals themselves, and become historical records for future generations, living documents of inestimable value. The World War in many of its phases was pictured to us even as it was going on; we were taken to the very front and witnessed the tragedy of the conflict amid the roar of the guns and the deployment of the embattled hosts. Last April, in Rome, was enacted one of the most magnificent and impressive ceremonies of the Church, the raising to her altars of one of her saintly and heroic children, St. Joan of Arc. With the express sanction of the Holy Father, this great religious and historical spectacle was filmed so that the Catholics of the world might see with their own eyes and participate in the august pageant. The Catholic Art Association is now showing this, the most unique motion picture in the world, in which the Holy Father himself is the central figure to the Catholics of this country. Do we ever stop to think how wonderful all this is through the magic of the motion picture?

It is difficult to believe that this marvelous development of the motion picture has taken place within a decade and a half. The motion picture has now penetrated every nook and cranny of the globe. Its influence is universal and greater than even the printed word. Its future possibilities no one can prophesy. It is potent for both good and evil. Why should not the children of light be as wise in their generation as the children of darkness and utilize it in the service of truth and virtue and wisely guard it from the debasements of the false and unclean?

The K. of C. and Radicalism

JOHN B. KENNEDY

JUST as departure from the straight and narrow path of probity brings disaster, so excursions in the superficially attractive byways of materialistic philosophy warp the minds of the excursionists so that they are unable, in time, to take a clear and exact view of the economic relationships of the various divisions of society. They become, first, mildly pink, then a robust maroon, and end in a flaring red.

There are so many ably mischievous advocates of the fifty-seven varieties of Socialism, and they have been so long and industriously extending their advocacy in the United States, that an observer of their ramifications and their energies wonders why the generation now at the brink of its majority is not wholly inclined to political radicalism. Several reasons account for the happy fact that the larger portion of our young men and women have declined to follow the Pied Piper of radicalism. The war, with its flood tide of active patriotism, is the chief reason. But one of the other reasons, one of far-reaching efficacy, is the quiet and persistent campaign

that the Knights of Columbus have waged for several years against the spread of extremely radical doctrines.

In 1910 the K. of C. came first to realize the necessity of entering the lists against the numerous and vociferous champions of a new order, or, better, disorder of society. In practically every city and town of the United States, and especially in the wide and thinly populated patches of industrial territory, the advocates of Socialism, political and economic, were engaged in the most dangerous form of propaganda, oral propaganda; the propaganda that has as its projecting force all the spiritual heat and magnetic power of the human being.

Invariably, at the forums held by these radicals, the general arraignment of capitalism, supported by the numerous genuine and specious arguments of the Socialist's ready reference book—Karl Marx—took a twist towards religion, and Catholics who happened to be in the audiences found their Church singled out for attack. It was in precisely this divergence from the paths of politics and economics, which, as citizens, they are free to pursue to their hearts' bent, provided their pursuit is orderly and minus dynamite, that the extreme radicals displayed their gross intemperance. They gave the Church credit for nothing; they ascribed to her the infamous role of protectress of the most maleficent forms of monied oligarchy, and in their false rapture at having something of definite body and shape to attack, they resorted to the commonest and most distasteful forms of calumny.

Their attack, repeated in a hundred different ways and in 10,000 different places, conjoined with their onslaught against all existing social institutions, demanded rebuttal. The Knights of Columbus entered the field. Selecting some of the best equipped publicists, men who had worked their way through the ranks of labor and who could not even be suspected of obnoxious capitalism, they sent them throughout the country to address open forums held under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus councils. The councils took care to invite the leading or, at least, the vociferous radicals of each community, and at the end of the lecturer's exposition of the happy middle way in economic and social readjustments—the way that takes ample cognizance of the rights and duties of both employers and employees—questions were invited. This question-hour always proved the most interesting and occasionally the most exciting time of the forum. Collecting these questions from a hundred different cities, from New York, Newark, Chicago, Philadelphia, Toledo, St. Louis, Kansas City, Dallas, New Orleans, Los Angeles, Tacoma and San Francisco, Helena and Sioux Falls, the Knights obtained a reliable dictionary of the radical mind as it operates in the United States. They found, furthermore, that the vast bulk of the questions were asked by young men and women, which showed that the radical propaganda was making dangerous headway.

The story of this campaign, continued for eight years

up to and including the first year of America's participation in the war, is simply told. The Knights of Columbus lecturers held forums for more than 2,000,000 persons and answered questions put to them by more than 800,000 persons. These questions were not always intelligent questions; quite often they displayed the crass ignorance of the questioner; but none of them were consciously frivolous and the bulk of them were based on a prejudice that organized religion was the foil and support of predatory wealth.

During the war the American doctrine of free speech was modified to meet the emergency; but with the safe conclusion of the war and the gradual evaporation of the fiery and impatient war spirit among the people, the radicals returned to the battle of propaganda, resuming it at the point where they had left off, and making the most of the discontent and inevitable disturbance of the reconstruction period, the end of which is not yet in sight.

There are many who realize that the end-of-the-war period held all manner of dangers for the United States. There are some, and acute observers, who believe that leadership by a gifted demagogue of a radical party during the recent presidential campaign might have made serious inroads into the native conservatism of the American people. The situation was not comfortable, as grievances were real. But the remedies proposed and still urged by the extreme radicals are not only unreal, they are fantastic.

The Knights of Columbus first set their hands to genuine reconstruction work, instituting hundreds of employment bureaus for the former service men, through which they placed approximately 500,000 men in good, satisfactory jobs. They sent hundreds of the men to college and opened up a nation-wide chain of free technical schools where they educated and are still educating tens of thousands who would otherwise be condemned to the pittance and sad prospects of the unskilled or semi-skilled worker.

Pushing this work forward with all their energy, the K. of C. were able to make a substantial contribution towards economic readjustment, and certainly towards the satisfaction of the men who had good reason to demand satisfaction—the men who had won the war for America. Ugly events would have been the order of the day without such care for the ex-service men as the K. of C. and other organizations were able to give.

When this work had been successfully launched and was enjoying extensive and intensive operation the Knights of Columbus renewed their forums campaign against the philosophic and political force that is known as Bolshevism. Their lecturers were once more routed through the country, to find that the radicals had everywhere preceded them. Now in practically every community the radicals have their talkers and their distributors of pamphlets. Their attack may not be intelligently directed from a general headquarters, but what it lacks in strategy it makes up for in force and persistence.

The fact is that tens of thousands of young Americans and American working men of all ages are left open to the propaganda of two extremes—the extreme conservative propaganda, directed in a hundred well-known ways, and the extreme radical propaganda. To the hard-working man who does not obtain what he thinks is the fruit of his labor the radical propaganda is often the more enticing and convincing. The Knights of Columbus, by their trained lecturers, present the gospel of the middle way, the way that admits the evils of society but that suggests the temperate, constitutional course of intelligent and gradual remedy—the way that insists on the rights and duties of both employers and employed, the way that demands that morality as expressed in and through religion be more associated with our economic and social system.

The Knights of Columbus drive is a constructive drive. The 2,000 K. of C. councils and 800,000 K. of C. members who sponsor that drive are not out against "reds" or "radicals" as individuals. No members of an organization recognize more quickly than the Knights the civic advantage of healthy radicalism, constructive radicalism that aims at uprooting social and economic evil by legitimate methods after first carefully examining the growth to discover whether improvement is possible before eradication is applied. The K. of C. are conducting a crusade to make converts to common-sense, to catch the minds that are intoxicated by the specious, malnourished materialism of Marx and his lesser disciples and to cure them before they surrender wholly to the wrong philosophy which, as we see in Russia, can without very great difficulty, infect an entire nation. The Knights center their strength on the defense of property because there is challenged a right of mankind, a right generous enough in its embrace to include the loftiest oligarch and the most rabid red. The Knights state the problem in common-sense terms and make their appeal to the common-sense of Americans, which, in its own unhurried way, will have cured many of our current economic and social ills by the time the radical reformers are scouring the land for new ills to exploit.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words

"Catholick Congregationalists" in New England

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The use of the word "Catholic" by the Rev. Mr. Sparhawk, of Marlboro, Mass., as quoted in a recent article in AMERICA, is not original with him. In my researches I have traced the use of the term by Congregationalists as far back as 1792. On June 19 of that year the Massachusetts General Court approved an act at their session in Boston to the effect that the

Congregational Church and Society within the said Precinct (in Rehoboth, Mass.) whereof the Rev'd Robert Rogerson is the present minister, are hereby incorporated into a distinct religious society by the name of the Catholick Congregational Church and Society in the second precinct in the Town of Rehoboth.

I also find that at the January session, 1795, the following order was passed:

On the petition of a number of the inhabitants of the town of Biddeford (Maine), praying to be incorporated into a society by the name of the Catholick Christian Society, it was ordered, that the pet'r's notify the town of Biddeford and appear on second Wednesday of first sitting of the next General Court, February 11, 1796.

The Anglican influence must have begun to work at this period in Maine and Massachusetts. Or, perhaps, the missionary work of Father John Thayer, the Congregational convert to Catholicism, had affected the above societies.

Lowell.

GEORGE F. O'Dwyer.

The Pilgrims and the Puritans

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The reverberations of the controversy recently waged in your columns, as to the historical difference between the Pilgrims and Puritans, have reached this distant coast. In common with other parts of the Union, we are interested in seeing even New England history correctly interpreted, and above all things we are concerned in having the true and attested historical methods followed in discussing any of the recorded facts of history.

Dr. Walsh is a facile and fascinating writer, and he has written many things upon a variety of subjects, with a general result of entertainment and instruction to his readers. But one of the penalties of promiscuous literary activity and skill is a habit of generalization that begets vagueness and often leads to inaccuracy. In this instance, as Mr. Lendrum has so clearly demonstrated, the learned and versatile Doctor has plainly perverted the facts of American history, and, what is worse, he has given his personal sanction and example in support of an exceedingly pernicious historical method, one that is peculiarly obnoxious and harmful to Catholics. Driven to the wall by incontestable citations and documented evidence, showing the error of his statements, he takes refuge, with an air of finality, in the lame and impotent, not to say dangerous and destructive, argument, that he spoke in a general and popular sense—that, by common usage and tradition among orators, writers and the populace of New England, the Pilgrims and Puritans have been considered to be practically the same, and that the names have been used synonymously for a long time by the general public.

This way of writing history has been used very effectively against the Church and against all Catholic authority by Protestant and anti-Catholic propagandists. It is the basis and substance of the whole Protestant tradition in law, literature, history and apologetics, as Newman so forcibly pointed out in his lectures on "The Present Position of Catholics in England," many years ago. If a thing has been said and repeated by respectable writers and speakers for a long period of time, and has thereby become imbedded in the popular belief by universal consent or apparent acquiescence, it takes rank as an admitted fact, or it ceases to be important whether it is actually true or not, since it may be treated as having been conceded by failure to combat it promptly and effectually. That is to maintain and perpetuate falsehood by prescription, and it constitutes the favorite theme of non-Catholic argument and agitation. To the same category belongs the staple contention of the religious bolshevik, that "one religion is as good as another, so long as it recognizes the existence of God and the necessity of correct living."

When history is written or interpreted by that standard, it is an easy and inevitable step to adopt a like loose and casual attitude towards supernatural knowledge and authority. The new President of the American Catholic Historical Association is the last man in the world to countenance, still less to appropriate, that devastating manner of discussing matters of fact in the annals of American development. If that Association is to accomplish the function its well-wishers expect it to achieve, it will repudiate and reverse the very same method, which has hitherto been employed in writing the history of both North and South America.

I have no purpose to volunteer as a participant in the controversy between Dr. Walsh and Mr. Lendrum, for the latter needs no assistance in the debate in which thus far he has been easily the victor. For the benefit of those who may wish to pursue the investigation further, I recommend the little volume entitled "The Colonies" ("Epochs of American History" series), by Reuben G. Thwaites, the scholarly editor of "Jesuit Relations," author of a "Life of Father Marquette," an antiquarian writer of the highest authority, and himself a native of Boston. From pages 116 to 177, inclusive, there is given a succinct and correct account of the early settlement of New England, and the facts related conclusively establish the accuracy of Mr. Lendrum's contentions and the error of Dr. Walsh. Of course, Thwaites, like nearly every other writer of American history, for most of them have been New Englanders, repeats and amplifies the tradition that the Pilgrims and Puritans were the pioneers and founders of religious and civil liberty on this continent, the first real democrats in the modern world, and withal the exclusive purveyors of justice, benevolence and enlightenment in the western hemisphere. This, however, is merely by way of opinion and inference, and does not affect the bald facts of the recorded transactions. It is but another instance of the evil above mentioned, of writing history according to popular and prevalent tradition, rather than by the actual record and the plain truths of the time and place.

To my way of thinking, entirely too much has been made of both the Pilgrims and the Puritans in American annals. At bottom, there was very little to admire in their characters and careers, and when the whole truth is told they really contributed in a minor degree to the origin and development of American nationality in its wholesome and whole-hearted vigor and individuality. There was plenty of cant and hypocrisy in both sects, and on occasion, throughout our history, these despicable traits have disturbed our social life and distorted our political institutions. Long ago a distinguished patriot, himself a New Englander, voiced the wish that instead of the Pilgrims landing on Plymouth Rock, the Rock had landed upon them. Mr. Evarts, in a public address, once declared that "the first thing the Pilgrims and Puritans did after landing was to fall on their knees, and then upon the aborigines." A careful and candid estimate of their combined influence in their own day and since fully justifies the feeling expressed in those utterances.

Seattle.

DUDLEY G. WOOTEN.

George Washington—To-Day

To the Editor of AMERICA:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

The first signature affixed to the above is that of George Washington. One hundred and thirty-four years is a long time as years go, but short when the tranquillity of a commonwealth is placed as a target for the guns of the Smith-Towner bill. George Washington, the man of peace and war, understood, as far as man can, the meaning of domestic tranquillity, and the blessing of liberty. His was no mean mind cramped within the narrow cell of prejudices and ignorance; no man was broader in his views when the general welfare of thirteen States with their individual inhabitants stood before him for consideration, and no power was sufficiently strong to deter him from the stand justice would require. The result is that we enjoy and, as long as the intricate, bureaucratic control of education is barred from our national laws, will continue to enjoy, the justice, the tranquillity, and the blessings given us by that parchment to which is appended the name of "The Father of his Country."

Education was not a thing unknown to the leader of men of

over a century ago. Washington knew then, as well as we know now, the relation of education to good citizenship; he was at least as solicitous for the educational training of his fellow-men as for the improvement and development of the rural art. But a national law or problem affects all classes, and a universal law once passed can be detrimental to some division or other that goes to make up the whole. For Washington to have advocated a national law, a law of control, a universal law of public education, would have been to wrench from religious, private or non-vested institutions of learning the justice he had pledged them and to destroy the security which liberty had promised. To grant to the Government or to a Federal bureaucracy the power of promotion and the control of the educational systems of the States was to shatter domestic tranquillity.

Our thirteen States were to be one in liberty, but not one in creed; one in the common defense, but not one in discipline; one in the promotion of the general welfare, but not in the waiving of their inalienable rights as States. And so here the State must safeguard its present educational system from the ravages of the modernists for "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." (Art. XIV). Freedom of education is as great a privilege of a citizen as is free speech and free press, and once a bureaucracy promotes and controls with a lash of \$100,000,000 the schools, and possesses through its Secretary the power to judge the appropriate use of the lash (and we know what appropriate means when applied to a governmental enactment) the States forfeit their inalienable rights. Yet the latter-day patriots would place the States, in those grants protected by the Constitution, subservient to a monarchical head; and more, would have a Federal centralized bureau not only promote or manage, but even control the powers reserved to the States.

George Washington was more than a twentieth century diplomat. He realized that if Congress usurped the powers of the State the result would be inevitable: "One State will comply with its requisitions, another neglect it, a third execute by halves, and all will differ either in the manner, the matter,—that we are always working up-hill." True, Washington believed and upheld a strong central power, but that did not mean the lashing of the serf by the Saxon lord. Hamilton, the confrère of George Washington writes, "The sovereign of an empire under one simple form of government has too much power; in an empire composed of federated States, each with a government completely organized within itself, the danger is directly the reverse." He enumerates in what Congress should have sovereignty, but he does not and dares not touch the question of press, speech, education and the organized laws of the State.

If Washington did, and I do not doubt it, urge the people "to promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge" (N. E. A. November, 1920), the *Bulletin* clearly states that he urged the people and not the Federal Government. The people make the laws of the State, at least it is their right, while it would seem from the Smith-Towner faction that they had no voice in the national assembly, nor are the people even considered qualified "to petition the government for redress of grievance."

St. Louis.

M. T. LAMBIOTTE

Champ Clark and Government

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Probably the late Champ Clark had fewer enemies and more personal friends than any man in public life for the last quarter century. Enemies he had, and bitter ones, but the marvel is that a man who served in the lower house for twenty-six years, during eight of which he was Speaker, had so few. He was not exempt from all the failures of a politician's life, and his course in the last few years of his career did not wholly please his con-

stituents in Missouri. It is said, for instance, that his well-known hostility to the Smith-Towner bill and similar Socialistic schemes, cooled considerably after his advance to high place among the Masonic fraternity. But on the whole, he leaves the impression upon the country of an intelligent man whose political ideals were high. Addressing his Missouri neighbors in 1911, he said:

It is constantly asserted by the unthinking that we have too much politics and too many politicians. When we reflect that the word "politics" in its higher and nobler sense means the science of government, we must concede that the more politics we have the better. For government affects the happiness and prosperity of everyone, and therefore we should strive to make our governments, Federal, State and municipal, as nearly perfect as any human institution may be.

There are not enough politicians. In a country whose institutions are based upon popular suffrage, every man should be a politician, and every man owes a part of his time, energy and talents to the service of the State. I do not mean that every man should run for office. That is a poor business at best; poor when you succeed; inexpressibly poor when you fail. I have been tried by both extremes of fortune, and speak by the card on that subject. What I do mean is that every citizen should as far as in him lies, study the problems which confront us, and help as far as he can, to solve them for the betterment of government, the improvement of society, and the perpetuity of the republic. If need be, he should become a candidate for office, as a duty to his country and his fellows.

It is the duty of every citizen to attend both the primaries and the general elections, to the end that good and capable men may be selected. The man who fails to do that, except for valid reasons, falls short of living up to his privileges, and of assuming his fair proportion of the governmental burdens. Neglecting that, he is estopped from setting up a lugubrious howl about the unfitness of officials and the corruption of politics.

There is a wealth of practical wisdom in these words. When honest men refuse to take part in the elections, it is only to be expected that their places will be filled by rogues who think public office not a public trust, but an opportunity for private gain. The cry of men like Senators King, Thomas, and Borah, for years has been that Americans are no longer interested in the Federal Government, except as an agency for the promotion of paternalism, and that they know little and care less for the Constitution. That is the reason why schemes so utterly abhorrent to the pristine American spirit as the Smith-Towner and the Sheppard-Towner bills can obtain a hearing. If we Americans do not begin to take an interest in our Government, soon the American Republic as founded by our fathers will be but a memory.

Washington.

J. W.

More Taxes

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Viewed from the financial standpoint, the Smith-Towner bill is extremely unwise. Will the shoulders of the already overburdened population be able to stand any more assessments? The latest report issued by the Department of Labor shows that 3,473,466 persons, at the time of its publication, were unemployed. The Soldier's bonus is probably to be met. Then, too, there are the individual income taxes. It has been suggested that we cancel the war-loans made to foreign countries. If we are burdened with any more taxes, we shall not have to see the film story, "Over the Hill to the Poorhouse," to realize the horrors of such institutions, we shall be experiencing the reality. And that, too, quite without necessity, for after all most States are doing the very work that the Smith-Towner bill seems to think undone. Why duplicate, and thus break the backs of many a poor man? But will the poor man allow his back to be broken?

New York.

A. P.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Reform Begins at Home

IF society is sick, who shall heal it? And society is sick, perhaps unto death. There are evils in the body politic which the man who loves his country best will not deny. There are evils in the commercial life of the country, so deep that they range class against class in bloody warfare. There are evils in the family which threaten to destroy domestic society. As these evils force themselves upon public notice, we who once were citizens of a Christian nation begin to realize that the nation is no longer Christian. Numerically, Christians are a minority, and the influence, which as Christians they once exercised in public life, grows weaker day by day. God is out of the schools which train more than 20,000,000 of our children. He is out of the acknowledged life of the nation. He is now passing, it would now seem, from the hearts of millions in this country.

What will the end be? It was a deep student of statecraft, Burke, who held religion to be the foundation of society, and a greater statesman, Washington, who taught that religion was the indispensable support of a State's true prosperity. When religion grows weak, thought Burke, "the whole fabric cannot be stable or lasting." "Let us with caution indulge the supposition," wrote Washington, "that morality can be maintained without religion." To shut our eyes to the decay of religion and morality in the United States, while shouting that this is the superlative government of all time, is the one best way to bring the country to ruin. As individuals we are neither much better nor much worse than the rest of men, and if, as a people, we embark upon courses which have destroyed other nations, we cannot hope to be found an exception.

The end will be destruction, if we do not retrace our steps. As long as there is the will to reform, salvation, national and personal, is possible. The Catholic publicist often turns from his survey of society with feelings of depression, but these are feelings that are dissipated when he looks to the way of healing opened by Christ on His journey to Calvary. The world is not saved by

the devices of man, but only by the acceptance of the principles of Jesus Christ. All public reform must begin with the reform of our own lives. Personally, we may be insignificant, but the combined force of millions of Catholics, earnestly endeavoring to practise the teachings of Jesus Christ in their own lives cannot fail of its effect on the life of the nation. No spiritual striving is ever lost.

The Catholic who does his country the best service is not the man who merely waves a flag and protests his devotion to the Constitution. He is the man who frequents the Sacraments, who edifies his neighbor by his obedience to conscience, who sends his children to Catholic schools, the country's strongest defense against lawlessness, who is interested in every movement which extends the Kingdom of God on earth, and who if he thanks God he is an American, knows that his Faith is a gift for which the only worthy thanks is his unswerving loyalty to God, Church and country.

The Question of Censorship

THE best comedies in connection with the silver screen are not the affairs for which the producers spend hundreds of thousands in advertising. These are often but poor sad affairs, sordid and vulgar, tiresome and depressing. The real comedians of the moving-picture world are the producers who assume the highly moral tone. Their spirit, they say, is not commercial. Of course, they expect a reasonable return on their investments, but their deepest interests are as truly spiritual as are the interests of religion or education. Their guiding principle is not to give the public what the public wants, but by patience and forbearance gradually to induce the public to demand what, by the canons of art and religion, the public should desire. Keeping this principle firmly in mind, they proceed to manufacture and to market moving-pictures which justify an increase of salary for the police.

Hence it comes to pass that in spite of these highly moral producers, the moving-picture house continues to be a grave menace to the moral and mental development of the rising generation. The films which really help our young people are, unfortunately, few. The films that are coarse and vulgar, when not actually indecent, are daily becoming more numerous, and because of the impression, perhaps well founded, that bad films are more profitable than good films, the always ungrateful task of the censor daily becomes more difficult. Recently the Federal Grand Jury, sitting in Brooklyn, returned a presentment asking the creation of a Federal Board of Censors, with power to forbid the shipment in interstate commerce of objectionable films, "particularly those considered unfit to be viewed by the young." "The Grand Jury held," truthfully adds the *New York Herald*, "that the present National Board of Censors has no real power over the production of films." This is the Board recently canonized by that archpriest of reform and merchant of films, Mr. William A. Brady.

The purpose of the Grand Jury is most commendable,

but that a Federal Board could do much to improve the present deplorable conditions may be gravely doubted. If enforced, the present Federal statutes are sufficient to exclude indecent and obscene films from interstate commerce, and it would seem wiser to enforce these laws rather than to set up a new commission of censors. The fundamental argument against a Federal censorship is that it tends to transfer from the States and the cities a duty which belongs primarily to them and which they alone can perform with satisfaction. There is always danger of a general breakdown when a local community refuses to deal with a question that is primarily, and, in the present instance, painfully, local.

Furthermore, a Federal Board would probably be slow in action at the very time when decisive action is imperative, and could hardly escape the influence of party politics. Even State Boards have failed in these respects. There is probably not a city in the country where the local ordinances are insufficient to bar improper films, or where, in the present state of public opinion, suitable ordinances could not be enacted. But it is never easy to decide what campaign against the menace of the film will be most practicable. A Federal Board working in harmony with vigorous local boards might be useful, but it will do nothing but harm if it tends to break down local censorship. However, charity begins at home. Perhaps the best plan, as far as legal aid is concerned, would include strict city and State enactments, with the interest of the local religion, social and educational forces enlisted to secure their proper enforcement.

Juvenile Delinquency and the Home

A BOY of seventeen walks out of a Chicago bank with more than seven hundred thousand dollars in negotiable securities. A few weeks previously a youth of the same years had been convicted of a similar theft, also from a bank. The first boy simply "wanted to have a good time," and proceeded to invest in an automobile. The second youth had concluded that since his employers were paying him far less than he was worth, he was entitled to a large amount by way of occult compensation. In this view he seems to have been sustained by a sensation-mongering Federal judge, lately rebuked by a House sub-committee on the judiciary, who held him on suspended sentence.

Conditions typified by these two young criminals are by no means confined to Chicago. Comparative statistics of youthful criminality in the last two decades are not available. At best such data are frequently misleading, but since in recent years the education of the young in love of pleasure and ease has increased and their education in self-denial and devotion to duty has greatly decreased, an increase in juvenile delinquency would seem inevitable. For this result the schools, which persistently refuse to train our boys and girls in religion, are greatly to blame. To intensify the evils of a non-religious education, the startling prevalence of the silly doctrine that

the child must never be urged, much less forced, to do what he does not choose to do, has made anything like genuine training even in natural virtue a practical impossibility. Not all schools have yielded to this studied cruelty to the child, but many have failed to exercise a strong influence; and, in too many instances, what the schools have left undone in teaching the child to regard inclination rather than duty as the rule of life, foolish parents have completed.

Happily discipline as well as training in religion has usually flourished in our Catholic schools, although many a Catholic teacher is forced to see his work utterly spoiled by criminally careless or indulgent fathers and mothers. The need of the hour is obedience to all lawful authority. If the child is allowed to flout parental authority, the training which the school endeavors to give will be hampered and, in most instances, utterly spoiled. "I don't see why my boy doesn't improve," a foolish mother once complained to a Catholic teacher. "He's been with you for three months, and he's just as lazy and impudent as ever." "Madame," replied the harassed pedagogue, "if you will pardon me, I will observe that while he has been under my charge for three months, he has been under your charge for sixteen years and nine months." The school that can fully neutralize improper home conditions never did exist and never can.

A Blow to Americanization

CONGRESSIONAL military legislation has been far from favoring militarism. Reduction has been the policy, if the recent military bills may be taken as criteria. For Congress reflects to a great extent popular sentiment. Whether this is for the better interests of the country or not is another problem. But that this military policy is in direct proportion to the after-war feeling against militarism is beyond even the shadow of a doubt. Certainly there is a very general American feeling against a large permanent military establishment.

However, it is regrettable that the reduction policy adopted by Congress will deal a blow to one of the best Americanization schemes that up to the present has stood the test of practical results. Under the new law the Recruit Educational Center must go. For the Recruit Educational Center was dependent on the enlistment of illiterate and non-English-speaking candidates.

Hardly a year ago the Recruit Educational Center was established at Camp Upton. Since that time it has been extended to five other corps areas. It took the foreign or native illiterate and in remarkably short time taught him more than soldiering. The fundamentals of English and civics were added to the ordinary list of duties. It was the first time the army entered the Americanization field. It had taken up the battle of peace and justified its peace-time status. Its recruits could now go back to civil life at the expiration of their enlistment, with some understanding of American institutions and some motive for their patriotism. America had done something for

them. They would not be condemned by their ignorance to remain hewers of wood and drawers of water. And the training they received at the Educational Centers made their military careers more successful. Regimental reports show that these men in great numbers and in a very brief time became non-commissioned officers. So the army benefited as well as the individual soldier.

There have been various schemes adopted for Americanizing the foreigner. States, civic societies, municipalities, public and private agencies have essayed the problem. But it was the army that alone adopted a broad and consistent plan, calculated to influence 10,000 men year after year. And the army was brave enough to include the illiterate native-born as well as the foreigner. Because of its far-spread recruiting depots the army could take in the whole country and not merely some sections of the country. The army plan was really making the melting pot melt.

It is well to distinguish between an army solely bent on the game of war and an army safeguarding the ways of peace. The present law deals a blow at militarism, but it deals a blow at Americanization as well. In this it is faulty. It should make provision for the enlistment of the illiterate and non-English-speaking recruit. The added appropriation would be money well spent. It would not approach by many a dollar the cost of one battleship. In ten years a battleship is almost ready for the scrap heap. An intelligent citizenship on the other hand is an investment constantly increasing in value. In fact, without it there is no guarantee that democratic institutions themselves will not reach the scrap heap. Perhaps Congress will reconsider its policy and preserve the Recruit Educational Centers.

An Unamendable Bill

UNDER the patronage of Mr. A. Lincoln Filene and Mr. W. C. Redfield, an association has been formed in Boston to secure the establishment of a Federal Department of Education. At the same time the association declares its willingness to accept any amendments which will completely safeguard the constitutional rights of the respective States over their schools.

The association is asking the impossible. The bill cannot be amended. It cannot retain the essential features of the old Smith-Towner bill without destroying the rights of the States. Whatever its friends in all good faith maintain, the essence of the bill is the transfer of the control of education from the States and the local communities to the Federal Government.

That transfer is made actual and permanent by the power given the Federal Secretary over the annual appropriation of \$100,000,000 authorized by the bill. The Secretary orders the payment of State apportionments, only after the State has filed a report with the Secretary. He is not obliged to accept this report. If he rejects it, the State is cut off from all apportionments. Further, the State must annually file a report showing in what manner

the Federal apportionment has been spent "in accordance with the provisions of this act." What is or is not in accordance with these requirements is left to the ruling of the Secretary. The Secretary, and he alone, is directed to examine these reports, and if in his sole judgment the requirements of the act have *not* been met, the State is excluded from all participation in the Federal subsidy. As the Rochester *Post-Express* remarks in the course of an able editorial against the Smith-Towner bill, if this is not the power of control over the local schools "the meaning of the word 'control' is something else than that which has always been accepted."

In other terms, if the State refuses to accept, in reference to its educational policy, the ruling of whatever political officer may at the time be Secretary of Education, it must lose its Federal apportionment. If it is willing to revise its educational philosophy as directed at Washington, it is restored to Federal favor. If it is not willing, it is cast out into the exterior darkness. This is absolute Federal control, and it is also the essence of the Smith-Towner bill. And it is nothing less than folly, if urged as an argument that the bill safeguards local control, to assert that in case of disagreement, the State and the Federal Governments would come to terms. They would, but with the Federal Government holding the whip hand. What these officials might or might not do, is not left in doubt by the Smith-Towner bill. The cold stark truth is that in case of disagreement the Federal authority is supreme, and the State must yield. "Where State and Federal views conflict," it was said by the Federal Court at Utica, New York, on February 21, 1921, "the judgment of Congress and its constituted agencies shall control." No man who has even a bowing acquaintance with the prevailing American system can for a moment maintain the contrary.

Accepting the good faith of the association in asking for amendments, the following are offered, also in all good faith:

1. Insert an amendment stating that in all cases of conflict between the State and Federal authorities, the State authorities shall prevail.
2. Make unlawful any Federal move to control education by inspecting the local schools, attempting to set educational standards, or by requiring reports from the States on their educational systems, as a condition of participation in Federal appropriations.
3. Forbid the States to file at any time any such reports at Washington.
4. Eliminate the clause authorizing the annual appropriation of \$100,000,000, for educational purposes within the States.

These amendments, as is clear, completely destroy the Smith-Towner bill, precisely because they make Federal control of education within the States impossible. And that Federal control is the essence of the Smith-Towner scheme. It is, therefore, absurd to think that the bill can be amended. Unless we propose to enshrine in a Department at Washington an unconstitutional centralized control of the schools, nothing can be done with the bill, except to kill it.

Literature

MR. CHESTERTON'S NEW BOOKS

GILBERT K. CHESTERTON'S arrival in New York was happily timed with the issue from the press of "The New Jerusalem" (Doran), which was soon followed by "The Uses of Diversity" (Dodd, Mead.) In mere bulk the first is the largest of his books, perhaps because it is, according to the author, "only an uncomfortably large note-book," but it is a more remarkable note-book than you will pick up in a week of years. For it is a rich, kaleidoscopic note-book that nobody but the prince of paradoxers could have written in Jerusalem or elsewhere.

As the "New Jerusalem" is a book of travel it can scarcely escape comparison with "Irish Impressions," which Mr. Chesterton published last year. Though both books are roughly on the same plan, which consists of first giving a few chapters of random and superficial impressions and then deepening into a study of the underlying philosophies, "Irish Impressions" is inferior to "The New Jerusalem." The reason is that little in "Irish Impressions," except the last chapter, is new to one who has read all the fugitive essays in which Chesterton touches upon Ireland, while the "New Jerusalem" contains many fresh points of view even on subjects like the Crusades which he has talked about before. Perhaps, too, the reason for the superiority of the "New Jerusalem" lies in the fact that Jerusalem, being a place where such different religions as the Jewish, the Catholic and the Moslem contrast like the primary colors, offers a richer field for Mr. Chesterton, who loves to paint in primary pigments and who can see contrasts with a discerning eye. At the time he wrote "Irish Impressions" the contrast and cleavage between oppressor and oppressed was not so vivid as it is now.

"The New Jerusalem" is a better book than anything Mr. Chesterton has written since August, 1914. For the author suffered then a war-change for the worse. Controversial writing is rarely literary. And the traces of propaganda in "The Crimes of England," "Irish Impressions" and "A Short History of England," make these books somewhat weaker than such pre-war books as "Heretics" or "Orthodoxy." The "New Jerusalem" returns to the tradition of "Orthodoxy."

Development of ideas, as Cardinal Newman well says, is a true test of their depth. Now in the "New Jerusalem" we find ideas that we have noticed all through the prose and poetry of Mr. Chesterton. There is his love of medievalism, his appreciation of the Catholic creed as a key to history, his keen analysis and destructive criticism of modern sham science, especially the sham science of the origins of religion, and his insistence on the transformation and conservation of the Roman Empire by the Catholic Church. But we find that these ideas are not merely repeated in the "New Jerusalem" but they are developed from every angle, shadows are admitted where serene light reigned before and critical acceptance is accorded to ideas that were enthusiastically and uncritically received in his earlier books. Mr. Chesterton is a great author.

Three concrete instances of development in the "New Jerusalem" will exemplify Mr. Chesterton's greatness. Take medievalism, variety in unity and anti-Semitism. Critics have accused the author of building a crystal palace excluding every evil and including every perfection, and calling that vision "the Middle Ages." In the "New Jerusalem," however, this idea has been developed by criticism. Mr. Chesterton still holds to his first conviction that Europe was happiest in the Middle Ages. But he is no longer an uncritical medievalist. He now sees how right the Middle Ages were because he sees exactly how wrong they were. But comparing modern wrongs with medieval, he

finds that modern wrongs are more intolerable. Thus he speaks:

Now is it quite true that there is less general human testimony to the notion of a New Jerusalem in the future than to the notion of a golden age in the past. But neither of those ideas, whether or no they are illusions, are any answer to the question of the plain man in the plain position of this parable; a man who has to find some guidance in the past if he is to get any good in the future. What he positively knows, in any case, is the complete collapse of the present. Now that is the exact truth about the thing so often rebuked as a romantic and unreal return of modern men to medieval things. They suppose they have taken the wrong turning, because they know they are in the wrong place. To know that, it is necessary not to idealize the medieval world, but merely to realize the modern world. It is not so much that they suppose the medieval world was above the average, as that they feel sure the modern world is below the average. They do not start with the idea that man is meant to live in a New Jerusalem of pearl and sapphire in the future, or that a man was meant to live in a picturesque and richly-painted tavern in the past; but with a strong inward and personal persuasion that a man was not meant to live in a man-trap.

An idea that recurs frequently in Mr. Chesterton's "Orthodoxy" and "Heretics," as well as in all of Cardinal Newman's works, is the idea that variety in unity should be the mark of a true religion, and that of all things the most disastrous in religion is an exaggerated simplification of one idea. Mr. Chesterton here deepens this idea by showing how Mahomet fell into the snare of one-sidedness by insisting forever on one idea to the exclusion of all others. A brief quotation will explain this:

Islam was a movement; that is why it has ceased to move. For a movement can only be a mood. It may be a very necessary movement arising from a very noble mood, but sooner or later it must find its level in a larger philosophy, and be balanced against other things. Islam was a reaction towards simplicity; it was a violent simplification, which turned out to be an over-simplification. Stevenson has somewhere one of his perfectly picked phrases for an empty-minded man; that he has not one thought to rub against another while he waits for a train. The Moslem had one thought, and that a most vital one; the greatness of God which levels all men. But the Moslem had not one thought to rub against another, because he really had not another.

Mr. Chesterton has developed at length in the last and longest chapter of the book his ideas on the Jews. It clears up a number of misconceptions about his attitude and certainly frees him from the charge of anti-Semitism. After all, that charge was in substance this: "It consisted entirely in saying that Jews are Jews; and as a logical consequence that they are not Russians or Rumanians or Italians or Frenchmen or Englishmen." The author is a Zionist. He thinks that the Jews should be given separate States to be carved out of Palestine. He believes that if all Palestine were put under the control of the Jews the Moslems and the Christians would unite against the Jews. Mr. Chesterton thinks that Zionism should be tried, because if it succeeded, it would be better both for the Jews, who wanted to take part in the experiment and for the Europeans who assisted them, while if it failed, the failure would help revealed religion. Because "with the failure of Zionism would fall the last and best attempt at a rationalistic theory of the Jew."

There are other interesting subjects discussed by Mr. Chesterton in the "New Jerusalem." Especially noteworthy are two chapters on the present position of supernatural truth in relation to science, in which the author dissects the theories of Wells, George Moore, Huxley and others and continues a line of argument from "Orthodoxy."

"The Uses of Diversity" is a new essay-book by Chesterton. As the title indicates the essays are on various topics and are

of varying excellence, some being quite as good as his earlier essays and some considerably poorer than his "Defendant" or "Tremendous Trifles." The best are the essays on literary men like Wyndham, Meredith, Tennyson, Rostand, Shaw, Wells, Dickens or on the literary art like the essays on "The Silver Goblets," "On Historical Novels," "On Stage Costume," and "Pseudo-Scientific Books." The essay on the Japanese is good, the two on the Irish are rather flat after "Irish Impressions" and the one on "Our Latin Relations" is particularly perverse because it illustrates a strain of sophistry in all Mr. Chesterton has said of the Germans since August, 1914.

It is safe to say that books like "The New Jerusalem" and "Orthodoxy" will live. Their enduring worth will discredit the dicta of Mr. Chesterton's critics, who say that all his work is ephemeral because he is a journalist. This is true if they rely on the fact that journalism is in general highly perishable, since it is written to meet the crisis of a day. Now it is easy to admit that such books of Chesterton as "The Crimes of England," "The Utopia of Usurers" and all his novels will not last. And this for the simple reason that the themes are dead issues now. But it is extremely difficult to admit that any book of Chesterton that was written to meet some need of the day must necessarily perish. For he has often treated some contemporary subject after the manner of Burke and Newman. "Orthodoxy," for instance, like Newman's "Apologia," is a piece of journalism called out to meet a special challenge to the author. "Irish Impressions" and "The New Jerusalem" are examples of noble journalism too, for they are written in such a way that they will command attention when the present actors have left the stage.

ALFRED G. BRICKEL, S.J.

FETTERED, YET FREE, 1921

With brow serene, she meets the Tyrant's blows,—
Though bound, still Queen, indomitable, free!
Erect, defying rage and treachery
To quench the light that in her spirit glows!
She smiles, contemptuous of cruel foes;
Her scornful lip rebukes their fiendish glee:
Her flashing eye, afame with Liberty,
Quails not before new centuries of woes.
With Faith sublime, she lifts to God her prayer,
His will Divine shall rule her destiny.
The Faith of Patrick shields her from despair,
Her soul shall ne'er be bound by Tyranny!
No human force can keep her from her goal;
God's strength is hers; God's Faith is Erin's soul!

V. E. F. DUNDALGAN.

REVIEWS

A History of Penance, Being a Study of Authorities. By OSCAR D. WATKINS, M. A. Two Vols. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$16.00.

Mr. Watkins, an Anglican clergyman, here presents us with an authoritative volume of fine scholarship on one of the topics to which no one who claims to be a Christian can remain a stranger. With the instinct of the genuine historian he has gone to the sources. Second-hand testimony he rejects either entirely or uses it sparingly and always judiciously. He thus avoids the mistake into which even such a scholar as Hallam once stumbled and for which he was courteously but sternly called to task by Lingard. The book is divided into two parts, the first giving the history of Penance for the whole Church from the beginning to A. D. 450, the second, its history in the Western Church from 450 to the Fourth Lateran Council in 1212. The first part is admirably developed, the second while sufficiently thorough gives the impression of having been not skimped certainly, but slightly curtailed. Two admirable summaries of the whole work are also given.

The author keeps constantly on the trail of his authorities. He faithfully sets his steps in their tracks and allows nothing to distract him from his purpose. His plan is a simple but telling one. He prints in the original Greek or Latin language the documents of Apostolic, sub-Apostolic and subsequent periods bearing on his theme. He then gives a careful summary of these in English, with an enlightening bit of commentary when necessary and with the texts before him draws his conclusions. With most of Mr. Watkins' conclusions Catholic scholars can agree, for the reason that he wrings from them nothing which is not evidently contained or clearly implied in their words. He deals sincerely with his texts such as they are and nowhere seems bent on winning the victory for preconceived opinions. His views with regard to the great Sacrament of Reconciliation in its historic aspects agree with those of the learned Oratorian Morinus in the famous *"Commentarius Historicus de Disciplina in Administratione Sacramenti Paenitentiae."* In adopting Tertullian's views that in the Church of Africa as well as of Rome, the three capital sins of homicide, apostasy from the Faith and impurity mentioned in the "Apostolic Decree" (Acts. vi. 28, 29) were up to that time deemed unpardonable offenses for which there could be no reconciliation, Mr. Watkins must have been misled by Tertullian's exaggerations in a passage of the *"De Pudicitia."*

This work of the learned and conscientious Anglican divine will have one good effect. It must stir up renewed interest in all that concerns the discipline affecting the Sacrament of Penance in the early Church. Those who so frequently call attention to ecclesiastical tyranny, will see what liberty, in many cases, was left individual churches in its administration, see on the one hand the views of the milder Chrysostom, who was opposed to long years of penitential discipline and the painful publicity they imposed on the penitent, and defended the view that penance and forgiveness could be repeated, while rigorists maintained that they could not be reiterated.

In his second volume Mr. Watkins makes the statement, generally admitted to be substantially true, that the system of private penance, which now is the practice of the Catholic Church, is of Celtic origin, and was first practised in the Irish and British monasteries about the middle of the fifth century, then developed in the British Isles by the Penitential of Archbishop Theodore, and finally spread to Frankish territory and thence southwards. There are great difficulties to face in clearing this thesis of all objections. But not a few historical facts support it. These the author exposes with his usual temperance and impartiality. In both these admirable qualities he forms a happy contrast to the author of the "History of Confession and Indulgences," Dr. Charles Lea.

J. C. R.

A Scottish Knight Errant. A Sketch of the Life and Times of John Ogilvie, Jesuit. By F. A. FORBES and M. CAHILL. New York: Benziger Brothers. \$1.75.

This admirable little biography of a Scotch Jesuit martyr which comes from the pen of Mother F. A. Forbes, R.S.H., and M. Cahill, is preceded by a good sketch of the Church's condition in Scotland at the close of the sixteenth century. Many of the bishoprics and abbeys had long been in the hands of unworthy incumbents, owing to the abuse of the privilege of royal patronage, so that when the fanatical John Knox came ramping home from Geneva there was nothing to prevent him from rousing the multitude to pillage the churches and monasteries. To give an idea of the "confusion of religious ideas at the time," the authors tell how that fanatic mounted the pulpit of St. John's Church, in Perth, to preach on "the abomination of the Mass." But as soon as he had done, "a priest came out of the sacristy and began to say Mass." "One Mass is more terrible to me," said Knox, "than ten thousand armed men." A ridiculous picture is drawn of that wise fool, James I,

whom the parsons used to "pray at," reminding him publicly of his misdeeds and shortcomings while his Majesty boiled with helpless rage. The King was so short of funds when his wedding day drew near that he had to beg the Earl of Mar to lend him "the pair of silk hose," saying, "Ye wadna that your King suld appear a scrub on sic an occasion."

John Ogilvie, the son of Sir Walter, was born at Drum, in the Highlands, in the year 1583, was brought up probably a Calvinist, and went abroad to complete his education. But in 1599 we find him entering the society of Jesus at Brunn, in Austria. Fourteen years later he was ordained priest and only a few weeks after that ceremony he had landed at Leith disguised as "Captain Watson," who was eager to buy horses for the army. Betrayed while secretly ministering to the spiritual needs of Scotch Catholics, Father Ogilvie was arrested and brought before Spottiswoode, the disreputable Protestant Archbishop of St. Andrews. After suffering the torture of being deprived of sleep for nine days and nights Father Ogilvie was brought to Glasgow, tried by Spottiswoode and others on the charge of treason and was condemned to be hanged. On the scaffold Father Ogilvie was offered his life, his freedom, the Archbishop's daughter as his wife and a rich prebend, if he would deny his Faith. "Well then," he asked, "I stand here on the ground of my religion alone?" "Of that alone," was the answer. "On the ground of religion alone I am condemned," he then exclaimed with joyful satisfaction. "Maria Mater Gratiae," he prayed aloud as the ladder was withdrawn. Father Ogilvie was martyred at Glasgow on February 28, 1615, and the cause for his beatification has been introduced.

W. D.

The Mirrors of Downing Street. Some Political Reflections. By a GENTLEMAN WITH A DUSTER. Illustrated. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2.50.

The anonymous author of this discerning book believes that England is in danger of going to the dogs because she is now governed by politicians instead of statesmen. So he takes a cotton cloth and proceeds to dust-off "The Mirrors of Downing Street," in order that England's parliamentarians may see themselves as others see them. The main hindrance to true vision, he finds, "is breathed on the mirrors of these self-regarding public men in whom principle is crumbling and moral earnestness is beginning to moulder." The author first analyzes the character of Lloyd George, whom he describes as a "small man" who won the election of 1918 but "lost the world." Mr. Asquith no longer has "the earnestness which brought him to the seat of power"; Lord Northcliffe has "done nothing to elevate the public in mind and much to degrade it"; Arthur Balfour has never experienced "one genuine desire to leave the world better than he found it"; Lord Robert Cecil is merely "the shadow of great statesmanship," and Winston Churchill lacks strength of character. "At present he is but playing with politics."

The British public men in the book whom the author finds worthy of praise are Lord Haldane, Lord Rhondda, Lord Carnock, Lord Fisher and Lord Leverhulme. In his exhortation at the end of the book he remarks, "We must set a higher value on moral qualities, on intellectual qualities and on Christian qualities," if England is to be ruled by statesmen rather than by politicians, for "Less flippancy in the world would lead to more seriousness, more seriousness would lead to greater intelligence, and greater intelligence would lead to nobler living."

W. D.

Principles of Freedom. By TERENCE MACSWINEY, Late Lord Mayor of Cork. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$2.00.

This is a unique contribution to the literature of freedom.

With a very clear conception of the purpose of government and the true idea of liberty, the author skilfully goes about the explanation of the fundamentals necessary for the institution and preservation of both. He is no less discerning in his treatment of the pitfalls that bring ruin to governments and desolation to the peoples of a nation.

If there is one feature specially worthy of note in this composition it is the bigness of the spirit of its author, the Irish political martyr, which strongly stamps every page of the volume. With his native land torn with a thousand ugly wounds, Mr. MacSwiney was big and generous and noble enough to preach the truly Christian doctrine of forgiveness. With all the sad past clearly before him, England is to him no worse than a brother estranged. If the political fathers of the new Irish Republic are motivated in all their dealings by the healthy, sane principles so splendidly set down in this book, we have every reason for hoping that Ireland, when its day of complete independence at last arrives, will become in deed and in truth a teacher of right principles to the nations. And as the peoples of the world have admired Ireland for her constancy in adversity, so they will learn to imitate her righteousness in her hour of success. As Mr. MacSwiney writes in his chapter on "Brothers and Enemies": "If the greatness and beauty of life that ought to be the dream of all nations is denied by all but one, that one may keep alive the dream within her own frontier till its fascination will arrest and inspire the world."

To the hasty reader "Principles of Freedom" may seem somewhat too poetical and in a sense jejune, in composition. But this weakness, if so it should be called, is more than compensated for by the author's admirable exposition of the true doctrine on such subjects as war, militarism, religion from its political standpoint, and the principles of true liberty.

P. A. M.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The "Catholic Mind."—In good season for St. Patrick's Day the March 8 *Catholic Mind* contains the eloquent sermon on "The Mission of the Irish Race" which the Very Rev Peter E. Magennis, O. C. C., preached last year in Rome. He tells how he feared during the war that Erin's last line of defense, the Catholic Faith, was seriously menaced by the spread of materialism, but that he now rejoices to find his country, as of old, an apostolic nation still, as is shown, for example, by the success of the Irish mission in China. As Freemasons and other enemies of the Church seem to be scattering broadcast just now calumnies about the large number of Catholic deserters from the United States armies during the Civil and the Mexican Wars, Mr. Thomas F. Meehan, in the second article of the current *Catholic Mind*, effectively nails the lie, showing that no statistics on the matter are in existence. The issue ends with a short paper on "The Heroism of the Humdrum."

March Fiction.—"The Greenway" (Kenedy, \$2.25), Leslie Moore's new story, has for its central figure a typist of thirty-five, who falls heiress to a little Dartmoor cottage, where all her dreams are realized. A Catholic atmosphere pervades the story. There are good characterizations and descriptions but a lack of artistic coherency in plot and construction.—Constance E. Bishop's "Flame of the Forest" (Benziger, \$2.00) is another Catholic novel with its scene set in India. Clytie undertakes to win the heart of her sister Jinny's suitor and comes to a bad end. The story, which appears to be the author's first, is somewhat overcrowded with irrelevant incidents.—In "Babel" (Putnam, \$2.00), Hugh MacNair Kahler has written a half-dozen good short-stories. Why the publishers call them short novels is hard to tell. The essential unity of the short-story is

well preserved, his characterization is good and variety marks both plot and action.—Edward J. O'Brien's "The Best Short-Stories of 1920," (Small, Maynard, \$2.00), follows the lines of judgment laid down by the author in his previous volumes. To render life imaginatively in organic substance and artistic form is the short-story writer's task. By this norm Mr. O'Brien judges. Needless to say many readers will disagree with the critic in his selection. It is hard to see, for example, what there is in the volume's opening story save suggested grossness. The compiler admits no exclusive right on the part of any magazine to claim the best writers of fiction. His reading has been wide and he gives us the benefit of his judgment. Mr. O'Brien's book would be nearer the truth if he entitled it "Some of the Best Short-Stories of the Past Year." A word makes a world of difference.

An Irish Town.—Mrs. William O'Brien has just gathered sixteen readable essays into a little book describing life "In Mallow," (Benziger, \$1.25), a town in Cork. The author came as a stranger to Ireland and was soon captivated by the natural beauties of the country and the charm of the people's courtesy and piety. There are several good chapters about Canon Sheehan and Doneraile and the simple annals of the Irish poor are sympathetically narrated. Very striking is the contrast between the last two essays in the book, one describes picturesquely the quiet life of joy and innocence led by the people last spring, and the concluding chapter, "A Night of Horror," tells of the raid the "Black and Tans" made on Mallow last fall. Mrs. O'Brien writes:

Anyone walking now through our ruins would think this a town in the firing line in France or Belgium. The town hall . . . the condensed milk factory . . . thriving business houses and private houses are a heap of ruins. Upon the innocent population vengeance was executed without mercy and without any form of trial. Hundreds of helpless women and children lived the hours of agony suffered by their sisters in France and Belgium. . . . But this misery had a pang not known by the women of France and Belgium. In their case it was an enemy at open war that did the cruel deeds that made our blood boil; here it was the nominal protectors of the place who threw petroleum and incendiary bombs on unoffending Mallow homes and thriving industries.

The men and women of Mallow pray to be delivered from another visit of their "nominal protectors."

Good Lenten Reading.—Father Alexander, O. F. M., has written for religious and also for "Catholics in the outside world who aim at reproducing in themselves the cloister virtues." "A Spiritual Retreat" (Benziger Bros, \$3.00), based on the thirty lines of that beautiful Pentecostal hymn, the "Veni, Sancte Spiritus." The author finds his texts flexible enough to suggest reflections on nearly the whole system of Catholic asceticism.—Mother St. Patrick of *La Retraite du Sacre-Coeur*, has written a readable little biography of "Victoire de Sainte Luc, a Martyr under the Terror" (Longmans, \$1.40), a French nun of that Congregation who was guillotined at Paris, July 19, 1794, for distributing badges of the Sacred Heart. Victoire's parents were beheaded just after their daughter, as she had asked and obtained their leave to be executed first. "Dear father, dear mother, you have taught me how to live; with God's grace I am going to teach you how to die," she said as she joyfully mounted the scaffold.—Father George Schurhammer, S. J., presents us in "Der Heilige Franziskus Xaverius der Apostel des Ostens" (Xaverius Verlag, Aachen) with the first volume of a series of short biographies of the "Pioniere der Weltmission," to be published under the general editorship of the Rev. P. J. Louis. In the first biography, that of the Apostle of India and Japan, a

scholarly guide has been chosen. Father Schurhammer writes with the accuracy of the historian and the descriptive power of the poet. The "glimpses," that is his sub-title to his sketch, which he gives us into the soul of Xavier are rapid, but telling, and reveal its heroic proportions. Through long and scientific research, the author has mastered Xavier's times, ideals and the story of his epic labors, and builds up an inspiring picture of the great apostle.

Sister Angela's Books.—"Gilbert Guest" is the pen-name of Sister Mary Angela, a member of the Mt. St. Mary's Community of the Sisters of Mercy, Fifteenth and Castellar streets, Omaha, Nebraska, and the author of several story-books and plays. The best is "Margaret" (\$0.75), the account of how a little "glad-girl" made friends of everybody in the car during a long journey to San Francisco and was the means of giving her rich grandmother far more than that old lady could leave Margaret. "Snapshots by the Way" (\$1.00) is Sister Angela's book of short-stories, the best of which is called "A Meeting of Souls." "Home Light of the Prairies" (\$1.00), by the same author, is a three-act play with a flock of convent girls in the caste and centering around the restoration of the character of a man charged with stealing. Sister Agnes has also prepared some "Welcome Addresses" (\$0.50), which teaching nuns may find useful, and her most recent book, "Daisy, A Flower of the Tenements of Old New York," (\$1.00), picturesquely describes the varied adventures of a little girl who wins the hearts of all who know her. All the profits made from the sale of Sister Angela's books will be used to promote the important work the Sisters of Mercy are doing in Omaha.—Father Francis Gonne has gathered into a book called "The Fringe of the Eternal," (Benziger, \$2.00), a dozen interesting tales of a mystical character with the west coast of Ireland as their setting and with the simple, prayerful fisher-folk of the region as their characters.

The March "Atlantic."—A notable paper in the current *Atlantic Monthly* is Senator Phelan's article on "The False Pride of Japan." He shows from what is now happening in Hawaii, which is becoming an outpost of the Mikado's Empire, why the Californians fear Japanese domination. In these days of negation and disbelief it is very refreshing to find in the *Atlantic* so Christian a Resurrection play as Florence Converse's "Thy Kingdom Come." Perhaps the best thing in the number are these stanzas in memory of "Louise Imogen Guiney," by her life-long friend, Alice Brown:

Chill of dawn and dark of midnight no more shall fall between us.

Nor even the wet April wind, or largess of the sun,
Or the fretted beauty of bare trees against wide, skyey
splendors

Tempt us to desire of mortal days for you whose days are done.

From that other air you fled to, O fugitive freed spirit!
The veiling mists of beauty fall in rounded drops, like rain;
And the roots of life awake in us to drink them in and
nourish

Dark finalities of ardors blent of triumph and of pain.

Myrrh and spikenard bearing blindly, through mists of mortal dolor,
Your heavenly guidon brightened and ecstatic you fared
free,
And though here you struck but fitfully your halting note of
prelude,
Now your sweeping resonances surge and sing tumultuously.

Whip of toil no more shall touch you, nor din of turmoil
hinder,
Nor fate affright you quiet with his grisly mask of doom.
You shall lie by living waters, you shall walk with laughing
heroes,
You are garnered up in safety in a large and lofty room.

EDUCATION

The Smith-Towner Bill Is Not Dead

WHEN Kipling tries to be *real* bad, I feel like boxing his ears and sending him to bed without any supper, not even a crust. His badness always reminds me of the small boy who for the first time and of his own improper motion has pronounced the initial syllable of the name of a country anciently called Helvetia. It isn't bad, you know, but he oughtn't to say it. And Kipling the imperialist afflicts me with an awful weariness—"the line of the chin-strap that still showed white and untanned on cheek-bone and jaw" when young Hetherington of the White Lancers comes back on furlough to dear old Lunnon, after slashing and spitting goodness knows how many hairy beggars in Carpathia and other lands beyond the seas. But Mowgli on the Council Rock, and Baloo the Bear, and Bagheera the Black Panther, and Kaa, and little Toomai, grandson of Toomai of the Elephants, can set me, although not a little chap, "adreaming all the day."

But what I am now minded to recall is the premature song of the wife of Darzee, the Tailor Bird, about Nag the Cobra, "Nag is dead—is dead—is dead" and, as I recall the story, Nag wasn't dead at all. At least the most dangerous members of his family, Nagaina and all the younger Nags and Nagainas, were still at large, and more deadly than the elder male. Rightly, then, might Rikki-Tikki-Tavi in the dust remonstrate, "It's a song for you up in your nest, but it's war for me down here."

A PREMATURE CHANT

NOW Nag and Nagaina are, by way of similitude, the Smith-Towner bill for the establishment of Federal control of the local schools, and the wife of Darzee has been telling us for at least ten days that this bill is dead. But it isn't dead at all. I wish I had a tithe of its life, vigor, and friends. The bill, although by this time it has another but unannounced name, was never more alive. Almost on the very day which first heard the rumor of its decease, a powerful association was formed in Boston, pledged to force it through Congress at the present session. On March 3, a section of the National Education Association, in annual conference at Atlantic City, adopted a resolution, more specious than truthful, calling on all good men to come to the aid of the bill, and wipe out the national disgrace of illiteracy as well as of so many good men still knocking at the gate of a Federal job. Nag is not dead. Nag's friends have been working for years with but one object in view. They have a powerful machine, and they appear to have plenty of money. They believe, some of them at any rate, that in a fight on the floor of Congress they can put the bill across. They have just as strong a resolution of laying the measure aside as France has of returning Alsace-Lorraine to Germany, or as I have of getting on a soap-box to urge that it be at once adopted. As a prominent member of the Senate wrote me in mid-January: "While the bill will probably not pass during this session [ending on March 4] still it may. In any case it will at once be reintroduced, and to slacken the opposition in the least would be a fatal error." So make no mistake about ordering a full suit of mourning for the Smith-Towner bill. The fight against Prussianism in the schools is not over. It is only beginning.

TANGLED WAYS

IN reendorsing the Smith-Towner bill on March 3, the National Education Association held that "an appropriation by the Smith-Towner bill for the removal of illiteracy, for the Americanization of the foreign-born, for the equalization of educational opportunities" is "necessary in the present crisis." "Crisis" is a good word, but in the present case, somewhat ambiguous. I have grown somewhat weary of the dollar-and-cents theory of education, and the common persuasion of the political pedagogue now unhappily in the ascendancy, that money alone is the beginning, the middle and the end of the educational process.

However, let us admit that we are in the presence of an educational breakdown (I suppose that is the idea the Association wishes to convey) that the States are incapable of caring for the educational needs of the people, and that, by consequence, in a majority of them illiteracy is rapidly increasing. But in all honesty, I must note that I know of no authentic figures which indicate a crisis of this nature. The only statistics I can obtain from the Bureau of Education end with the census of 1910, and the Bureau assured me no later than two months ago, that no more recent figures were available. As AMERICA has stated on more than one occasion, these authentic figures show a steady decrease in illiteracy from 1890 to 1910. Should the returns for 1920 mark an increase, it would not necessarily follow that the situation had gotten out of hand. It might merely follow that some States had not as yet adjusted themselves to certain new factors. But I pass over these possibilities to grant, for the moment, that the States cannot properly solve their educational problem, and with this granted, to deny absolutely that the Smith-Towner bill affords any remedy.

The reason is plain. According to the very authors of the Smith-Towner bill, *the bill exercises no coercive force whatever over any State*. If they so choose, every single one of the forty-eight States may utterly refuse to "cooperate" with the Federal Government. In that case, the bill, as far as the removal of illiteracy is concerned, would be utterly null and void. Hence we face this situation: The Smith-Townerites tell us that education has broken down within the States. The remedy they offer is a measure which they themselves loudly proclaim, *any State may reject*. How then, on their own showing, can the Smith-Towner bill remove illiteracy, Americanize the immigrant, or equalize educational opportunities?

CRUDE AND DANGEROUS LEGISLATION

SURELY, the country never saw a cruder piece of educational legislation. The bill adds nothing to the sum of our educational knowledge. It orders the accomplishment of certain results, but can find no better, in fact no other, way of accomplishing these desired results, than a money-appropriation. Judge Towner claims that his bill cannot possibly mean Federal control of the schools. Father Blakely claims that it cannot possibly mean anything else. Dr. Judd, of the University of Chicago, issued a statement in January which indicated that he was disgusted with the whole affair. Dr. Judd is an out-and-out advocate of Federal control of the schools, and in his view, the bill safeguards State control in one section and establishes Federal control in another. I am not ready to advance the proposition that Judge Towner, Father Blakely and Dr. Judd are either stupid or dishonest. Judge Towner gave his name to the bill, and I suppose the other gentlemen have studied it conscientiously. My own opinion is fairly evident, but I may here add to it. Dr. Judd seems to have forgotten how in case of controversy between a State and the Federal Government, the rule formulated at Appomattox is never violated. If a Federal act squints, the resulting doubt is never, so far as my knowledge goes, resolved in favor of the State.

FEDERAL CONTROL

HOWEVER, let no one conclude that the Smith-Towner bill exercises "no control whatever" over education within the States. It establishes absolute Federal control, and that, precisely, is the reason why it can never be amended to safeguard the constitutional right of every State over schools founded within its jurisdiction. Its very life and breath are Federal control, and in my opposition I am ready to follow Dr. Hadley of Yale, Dr. Hibben and Dean West of Princeton, Dr. Downing of the New York State Department of Education, Dean Burris of Cincinnati, and Dr. Kinley of the University of Illinois. Dr. Kinley gauges the situation with unerring eye when he says that under the Smith-Towner bill "the Federal Government takes a dollar from Illinois, returns perhaps twenty cents of it

on condition that Illinois will furnish another twenty cents, and then permit the agents of the Federal Government a thousand miles away to tell her what to teach her children and how to teach it." That is the essence of the Smith-Towner bill: a political machine centralized at Washington and destroying a right reserved under the Federal Constitution to the respective States. Nor will this political machine control the public schools alone. Under the Smith-Towner bill complete control of every educational institution, from the kindergarten to the university, is gradually inevitable. And in that day the dream of the great apostle of democracy, Bismarck, will have been fulfilled.

JOHN WILBYE

SOCIOLOGY

The Labor Spy in American Industry

INDUSTRIAL methods are bankrupt when confidence is destroyed. Cooperation is impossible where mutual distrust exists. How far we have unfortunately progressed in this direction can best be seen by a brief study of the now prevalent institution of labor espionage. It is not for the sake of agitation, but in the hope of promoting a true spirit of Christian fraternity and cooperation between capital and labor that the ugliness of this system is exposed.

Those of us who for many years have been questing along the open roads and down the devious by-paths of modern industrialism, have often enough stumbled across the workings of that sinister figure, the labor spy. In his own darksome occupation he is known, not by a name but by a number. The very corporation that engages his service cannot distinguish him from the genuine worker at his side. In labor-union matters he soon becomes a conspicuous figure and is likely to attain to positions of trust through his apparently vigorous championship of labor's cause and his outward defense of trade unions, where such exist. Yet he is circumspect and cautious, and for one such spy that is detected hundreds may go unnoticed. True or false, his reports are regularly sent through secret channels to his own secret agency. This itself will change its name to suit its purpose. There is, of course, no question here of Government detectives, but solely of the industrial spy, too often hired by large capital to betray the worker and so undermine every possible hope of any reconciliation between the two classes. He is the symbol itself of industrial distrust and insincerity and disorder.

THE UBIQUITOUS LABOR SPY

TURNING, as I write, to the latest clippings cut from the labor press, I find a recent statement accredited to Charles S. Whitman, the former Governor of New York, that the metropolitan city is filled with "mushroom private detective agencies," grafting upon business men. A memorial addressed to Congress by the Interchurch World Movement declares that: "The conduct and activities of labor detectives' agencies do not seem to serve the best interests of the country."

Labor is not unaware of the activities of these secret agents, and frequent reference is made in its press to the detection and expulsion of such spies from its unions. Thus the latest issue of the *Journal of Electrical Workers and Operators*, February, 1921, enters into the details of the recent exposure of ten such men who had achieved prominence in the trade-union movement in Akron, Ohio. Very few, if any local unions of importance, affiliated with international organizations, the editor observes, are without their quota of "company agents and detectives" operating to disclose the union plans, "and for the specific purpose of fomenting trouble and bringing about strikes at times unfavorable and inopportune for the workers."

Labor espionage is far indeed from being a new profession. A leading agency boasts that it specialized in it for over a quarter of a century. In Hamilton's "Current Economic Problems" I find the following adaptation of an advertisement as it appeared in *American Industries*, August 15, 1907:

WANTED—JOBS BREAKING STRIKES.

We break strikes, also handle labor troubles in all phases. We are prepared to place secret operatives who are skilled mechanics in any shop, mill or factory, to discover whether organization is being done, material wasted or stolen, negligence on the part of the employees, etc., etc. . . . We guard property during strikes, employ non-union men to fill places of strikers, etc. . . . Branches in all parts of the country. Write us for reference and terms. The Joy Detective Agency, Inc., Cleveland, O.

There was hardly a single worker or employer examined by the Commission on Industrial Relations, we are told, who did not have a story to tell or an admission to make relative to this system. It is not limited to the emergency of a strike, but to a large extent has been made an integral part of the modern capitalistic system itself. Blessed the employers who are free of it! The same method was at once introduced into Bolshevik Russia, where the labor spy became all but omnipresent under the proletarian dictatorship. Extremes meet.

CABOT FUND FOR INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

WITH these facts in mind we have reason to be grateful for the investigation conducted into this system of labor espionage under the auspices of the Cabot Fund for Industrial Research. It was made for Dr. Richard C. Cabot by Mr. Sidney Howard. The direct approach to labor organizations was undertaken by Mr. Robert Dunn. The former has drawn up a digest of his findings for the *New Republic*.

An entire army of industrial spies is disclosed, carefully trained, operating through the secret service departments of corporations, the spy service of large employers' associations, and through a dozen enormous detective organizations, with branches in every manufacturing center. Besides these are countless other smaller and local agencies, such as those referred to by Mr. Whitman. For all this tremendous apparatus there must evidently be an equally enormous demand. It is clearly to the interest of these agencies to stimulate this demand where it does not exist, to work upon the fear of employers and arouse suspicions in their minds. The agencies themselves are secretly advertised in letters to employers or even in the newspapers, as harmonizers, peacemakers, efficiency promoters, contributors to the stability of our national structure and stimulators of productivity, organized to the advantage of the employer, the employee and the public. They wear their halo gracefully.

"Don't you think it would pay you to know your men, know every man in your employ," such an agency insinuatingly writes to an employer. "It can be done quietly, inexpensively, by the use of the Corporations Auxiliary Company's Industrial Inspection Service." It is all so ingenuous! But what of the worker who under such conditions must always live in dread lest his friendly neighbor to whom he thoughtlessly unbosoms himself under the strain and exasperation, it may be, of over-work, is in reality a spy in the company's pay, who will report his words with whatever exaggeration he pleases or under whatever construction he wishes? What can be more destructive of all hope of industrial harmony than such a situation.

CORRUPTING THE LABOR UNIONS

BUT there are other aspects of this system. To ingratiate himself into the favor of the union men, to debauch their officials, to insinuate himself into the highest union offices, to use his influence to wreck the labor organizations or to involve them in financial disaster, to create turmoil and discord within their ranks, and perhaps to urge them on to deeds of violence and destruction that will redound on the heads of the poor deluded men, is naturally the height of efficiency on the part of the labor spy when he sets himself to free his client from labor-union embarrassments. At all events the union must be manipulated to serve the interests, not of the men, but of the employer.

It is mentioned as the proud accomplishment of President Ray of the Ray Detective Agency of Boston that for a long

time he held in the employ of his agency the president, secretary and treasurer of the local Iceman's Union, and it is known that the former president of the Bay State Carmen's Union was one of his detectives. Mr. R. J. Coach is quoted as boasting that he owned every union in Cleveland. But the most interesting evidence is that which Mr. Howard quotes from a book put out by the Sherman organization, and immediately withdrawn from publicity. The income tax of his new company, it may be said in passing, is given as \$258,000 for a single year, indicating the extent of its activities. Their method may be gauged by just two short typical passages from this "gem" of detective literature:

Our operators have obtained positions of influence in the union, so that they can easily influence the affairs within the organization in the proper direction for the welfare of the client.

We had been successful in splitting the union into three factions, one controlled by the committee, one by a Polish leader, and one by the president. . . . A meeting was called and the Italian employee whom our operatives had been cultivating and influencing fought against the secretary. These matters resulted in a general fight. The proper time had arrived to exterminate the trouble-making organization. We detailed a number of guards and they were immediately deputized. Ejectment papers were served upon the committee and they were ordered to leave the town, which they did.

There is the whole sordid story. What does it mean? It is the wealthy employer, the corporation director, whom we in reality behold in the undignified position of the labor spy, who is but acting as his agent. We behold him creep into the union, insidiously promote the disturbance of the peace, promptly invoke the sacred authority of the police, deputize his own guard, and with a grand gesture order the rebellious labor leaders to leave the town for fear of what else might befall them. He has saved the country. The whole scheme is diabolical. No other word can be used to describe it. The employer and the corporation directors, it will be argued, do not know these details. It is their duty to know them, or else they should not have employed these men with full freedom to enact this travesty of justice.

PROMOTING DISTURBANCES AND HATREDS

BUt the worst is still to come. Here, for instance, is a lesson in "Americanization" as staged by the new Sherman agency in the documents discovered in its Chicago office during a raid by the Military Intelligence and the State Attorney of Cook County. The indictment, we are told, was never tried; but here is the evidence in the directions given to the agency's operatives:

We want you to stir up as much bad feeling as you possibly can between the Italians and the Serbians. Spread data among the Serbians that the Italians are going back to work. *Call up every question you can in reference to racial hatred between these two nationalities.*

I spoke of the preceding act as "diabolical." I am sorry there is no stronger word left to characterize the present proceeding. Listen to a few more findings as briefly stated by Mr. Howard:

We need not be surprised to find situations pre-arranged in the plant of a prospective client, strikes prolonged rather than broken, rioters furnished by espionage agencies along with strike-breakers, trouble fostered where peace had been. Mr. Coach of Cleveland, a leading industrial detective, buys the Columbus *Labor News* during the street-railway strike in that city, and edits it to encourage the very agitation which he is being paid to break by the street railway company. In Minneapolis an industrial detective agency is caught working for both union and employer in the same strike. A spy brings to New York 500 copies of the "Communist Manifesto" printed by the radical department of a detective company and distributes them about various organizations of workers.

Who can ever determine how many of the riots and deeds of violence, against which large employers complain, were started

by their own professional provocateurs trained in this fine art of "promoting industrial harmony"? Labor's faults are open and evident to all, but God alone knows the dark deeds that have been done under cover of darkness by these corporation agents. Labor agents may at times be corrupt, but here is a system secretly working to make them so, and aiming to obtain positions of trust within the unions, to set member against member and perhaps financially to ruin their organization in the sacred cause of protecting private property.

It is without ill will towards capital and employers that the foregoing statements are made, but can employers fail to see that such practices must recoil upon their own heads? Let them destroy, root and branch, this system whose fruits are well described as: bad will, provocation, corruption and violence. There can be no industrial peace until capital and labor will face each other, as man to man, in mutual good will, inspired by the spirit of Christ, and deal with each other in open covenants, openly arrived at.

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S. J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Mammoth Mail School System Planned by K. C.

K. OF C. night schools now number 107 and accommodate 75,000 students. But not satisfied with this success the Knights are looking for new worlds to conquer. They have decided that the only way in which they can reach tens of thousands of those whom they believe to be entitled to educational aid is through the mails. Training by mail for more than 1,000,000 former service men and women is therefore the latest plan which they hope to put into effect as the concluding part of their reconstruction program. Night schools meet requirements in the large cities, and even in many of the smaller communities, they argue, but it is impossible to extend them into the rural districts. These latter are therefore to be reached by the largest correspondence school system in the world, if the plan here suggested is found to be feasible and not too costly. Success attend the venture!

Menace to the Mass

P ROHIBITIONISTS are at work devising a new plan that will render the celebration of Mass a cause of anxiety. Thus the Dubuque *Daily American Tribune* quotes the letter of an eminent Catholic addressed to a State prohibitionist director: "I have just been informed that there is danger of a Federal ordinance being issued from Washington, that henceforth altar wines can be sold by wholesale druggist firms only." This would not merely cause great difficulties in obtaining altar wines by easy shipments and on short notice, but would tremendously increase the price. Are there, as the writer may well ask, certain interests at the bottom of this movement that would abolish the authorized altar-wine firms? It would be a splendid opportunity for legalized profiteering. But the altogether unwarranted hardships and expenditures imposed upon Catholic priests are far from being the worst phase of such harassing legislation. The main objection against it must be urged upon strictly religious grounds. As the writer says:

To the Catholic priests no less than to the whole Catholic people of the United States, it is of the utmost importance to have pure and unadulterated grape wine for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. No priest is allowed to use wine for the Mass unless he is positively sure and certain (as far as certainty can be had, which must naturally rest alone upon the honesty and uprightness of a fellowman) that the wine is absolutely pure. For the Catholic priest, the sworn assurance given by a wine-dealer, who is himself a true and practising Catholic, offers the greatest security that we can possibly have in this all-important matter. On the other

hand how many wholesale drug firms are Catholic? How many of them would be willing to give a real affidavit to the bishop of the diocese that the altar-wine they sell is absolutely pure, and that they, being mere distributors have a corresponding real affidavit from the wine producer? How many of these druggist firms will take the trouble of getting personal and immediate knowledge of the personnel of the producers, their methods of production, the handling of the wine in their cellars, and so on? All these are important factors to the Catholic dealer who furnishes the priests with altar wine, and the bishop with his sworn assurance.

So far, as I am credibly informed, our Catholic wine dealers have given us very satisfactory assurance and service. What reason can there be of changing all this, unless it be to harass the Catholic clergy and those Protestant ministers and even the Jewish rabbis, who consider it a matter of their conscience and religion to use pure wine in their sacramental and religious services?

Our experiences with Prohibition are only beginning, but Catholics have already learned enough to see that the constant warnings of AMERICA were neither too urgent nor inopportune.

How Wages Affect Mortality

HOW intimately wages are connected with the life of the child born in the laborer's home is again vividly illustrated by the findings of the Children's Bureau in its investigations into infant mortality conditions in New Bedford, Mass. Unskilled and semi-skilled occupations predominate in the local cotton mills. Practically all the mothers, the report states, were in families where the father earned less than the amount necessary to maintain a decent standard of living. As a result half of the mothers were gainfully employed, chiefly in the cotton mills, before the baby was born, and two-fifths returned to their industrial occupations the year following the birth of the child. The consequence was that in the low wage group twenty babies out of every hundred born alive died before the end of the first year, while in the highest wage groups only six out of every hundred babies died. Poor home sanitation, congestion in crowded tenement districts, lack of adequate medical care, and a mother unable properly to care for her child, are the circumstances that increase to such an awful extent the mortality of infants. To this must be added the impossibility of a proper intellectual, moral and religious training for the children. In its report on infant mortality in Akron, Ohio, the Children's Bureau thus sums up its conclusion: "This report gives further evidence of the fact shown in the previous studies of infant mortality by the Bureau, that as fathers' earnings increase, infant mortality falls."

Brother Alpheus of the Christian Brothers

IN the recent death of the Rev. Brother Alpheus, at New York, the Christian Brothers lost one of their most illustrious members. It was fifty-seven years ago that as a keen and eager Irish lad, he came to New York and sought admission into the ranks of these devoted workers in the cause of Catholic education. He had previously completed his grammar school course at Killaloe Classical Academy and studied with success at the Jesuit college in Limerick. His teaching ability was displayed in his first appointments in New York, and before 1870 he had already achieved the position of a leader in educational circles in that city. During the next three years the same influence was exercised by him in Albany, where his name is still held in veneration. In 1873 he was put in charge, as principal and director, of the new St. Peter's School at Barclay street, New York. Later he was given jurisdiction over an entire group of parochial schools conducted by the Brothers, and in 1881 was made director of old De La Salle Institute. Of his successful administration during this period a writer in the New York Catholic News says:

The period of his incumbency was the most prolific in the history of this famous old school. Priests and Bishops, lawyers and doctors, journalists and captains of industry, officers of the army and navy, engineers and teachers issued from its classrooms and went forth to do honor to the Church, to the State, to society, and to the sons of the Teacher Saint, John Baptist de la Salle.

With great truth could old De La Salle then be called a real maker of men. Archbishop Hayes, Archbishop Mundelein and Bishop McDonnell were among those who came under the sway and influence of Brother Alpheus and his devoted band of teachers.

In 1888 Brother Alpheus traveled extensively on the Continent in the interest of education. On his return he was named inspector of schools and director of the La Salle Bureau. The past twenty years were spent at Clason Point Academy and at the New York Catholic Protectory. The De LaSalle Series of Readers, for use in the parochial schools, was compiled by him some twelve years ago as the ripened fruit of his long years of experience in the classroom. Their worth is best attested by the continued popularity they enjoyed. Brother Alpheus was a true Religious and a great educator. He profoundly loved the land of his adoption, but did not forget the land of his birth. "He was an ardent Sinn Feiner to the marrow of his bones," we are told, and he eagerly desired to see Ireland take her place among the nations of the earth. Two of his sisters followed his example and entered the Religious life in America. Both preceded him to the grave. Brother Alpheus' name was Patrick J. Coffey.

Britons in the American Red Cross

RAFTER astonishing disclosures are made by a correspondent in the Paris edition of the New York *Herald* regarding the employment of Englishmen in the American Red Cross in Europe. Disquieting rumors had for some time appeared in the Paris press that British employees had been retained in the service of the A. R. C., while Americans were sent home. On investigation the correspondent found that for two years the position of Chief of Personnel, before whom Americans had to appear for reprimand, was held by an Englishman. "By what right," indignantly asks the writer, "does an American organization subject American citizens to the indignity of answering to a Britisher for their conduct?" This person was finally replaced, and the Red Cross Commissioner for Europe, Mr. Robert E. Olds, explained that "with two exceptions it cannot be said that any position of importance is or has been held by Englishmen." The writer replies to this by saying that every position in the American Red Cross is of importance, and then continues:

I looked into those positions which the Commissioner classifies as unimportant. I found the bureau that "routes" outgoing personnel, buys their tickets, makes steamship reservations, etc., in charge of a British subject. I found the head of the important Cable Bureau a British subject. I found the second-in-charge of the very important department of Purchase of Supplies a British subject. I found British subjects in charge of cash payment vouchers in three departments. And I found the strictly confidential records, by which recommendations are given to or withheld from Americans, in charge of a British subject! In short, I found that the forty-two British subjects hold better positions and receive higher salaries than the average American employee of the so-called unimportant class.

I found further that most of these forty-two British subjects were holding these positions in June last, when 25 per cent. of the American personnel was returned to America.

The presence of a considerable number of French employees in the service of the A. R. C. in Paris can be explained by the necessity of working in harmony with the people of the country, but, asks the correspondent, are Americans with good records to be deprived of their positions, and sent home, while forty-two British subjects are retained in an organization supported entirely by Americans?